

THE REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW

No. 3.—JULY—1909.

I.

THE MARKS OF A TRUE RELIGION.¹

BY THE REV. GEORGE F. MOORE, D.D.

Where are the gods of Hamath and of Arpad? Where are the gods of Sepharvaim, of Hena, and of Ivvah?—2 Kings, XVIII, 34.

The officers of Sennacherib, standing beneath the walls of Jerusalem, summon the rebellious city to surrender. The other cities of Judah had already been taken, thousands of their inhabitants were captives in the hands of the invaders. Hezekiah was shut up in his capital, in Sennacherib's own words, "like a bird in a cage"; Isaiah describes the wide devastation in the midst of which Jerusalem was left "solitary as a lodge in a vineyard." Further resistance was vain; how should the city withstand the victorious armies of the great Assyrian empire? (See Isaiah x., 13 f.) In what did Hezekiah put his trust? In his military strength? The envoys tauntingly wager that if they should give him two thousand horses he could not find riders for them. In his Egyptian allies? Had not Egypt always proved a cracked reed, piercing the hand of everyone who leaned upon it? In his God? What was his god more than the gods of a hundred kingdoms which the Assyrians had destroyed in the might of their god Asshur?

¹ Sermon preached to the graduating class of the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church at Lancaster, Pa., May, 1909.

"Who among all the gods of the countries have delivered their countries out of my hand that Jehovah should deliver Jerusalem out of my hand?" "Where are the gods of Hamath and Arpad, of Sepharvaim, of Hena and of Ivvah?"

Where are the gods of Nineveh? history seems to echo with its own irony. Within less than a century after the Assyrian king uttered his taunt the empire he thought invincible perished from the face of the earth almost in a day, its capital, Nineveh, was laid in ruins, the very race seems to disappear from history. Only in our own time, the buried cities on the banks of the Tigris have been unearthed and the long forgotten names of their gods deciphered by curious scholars.

And where are the gods of the empires which contested with Assyria the rule of the world or succeeded it in the dominion—the gods of Egypt and Babylon, of Persia, and Greece, and Rome? One only of all the gods of that ancient world has escaped its fate—the despised god of Jerusalem against whom Sennacherib made his proud boast; of all the ancient religions Judaism alone has survived the centuries and become the mother of two daughters greater than itself, Christianity and Mohammedanism, which transcending the bounds of nationality have become the faiths of the most diverse races.

Why is it that the religion of Jehovah has thus outlived all its rivals? The cause cannot be found in its external fortunes. Israel was never a great political power; its religion was not carried to empire by the progress of a victorious nationality. Nor had the Jews the prestige of great intellectual achievement; their religion was commended by no philosophy, glorified by no poetry, no art appealed to the sense and imagination of men in its behalf.

The secret of its success must be something in the religion itself. What is it? At first glance the question seems hard to answer. In Hezekiah's time the religion of Jehovah appears to the external observer to differ in no way from the religions of the other peoples. Jehovah was the national God of Judah, as Chemosh was the national god of Moab or Asshur of Assyria.

He was worshipped in the same way as other gods; his temple in Jerusalem was like the temples of Phœnicia and Syria; an image in the form of a serpent was worshipped in it until Hezekiah himself removed it; the older sacred object, the ark, remained; the vestments of the priests, the sacrifices, the ceremonial restrictions, while in some minor respects peculiar, were not different in nature from those of the other Syrian religions. Why did it live while they died? Some one may answer: "The religion of Jehovah was the *true* religion; therefore it lived." But how do we recognize the religion of Judah in the days of Hezekiah as the true religion, except that our own very different religion has grown out of it, as we recognize the germ by the tree? This reflection seems to put us on the right track. The religion of Jehovah had in it, as the history of succeeding centuries to our own time shows, the potentiality of unlimited development which was lacking in its rivals. At a certain moment in the history of man on the earth the progenitors of the highest and the lowest races which we know and of many that have perished stood upon the same plane of culture; physically, mentally, morally, to all outward seeming, they were alike; but in the one, as the event shows, was capacity for progress, while others, lacking this, remained where they were or advanced for a time and then became stationary or retrograded and degenerated. So it has been with whole civilizations; so it is with religions. The law of the survival of the fittest holds in this sphere also, but fitness to survive is not mere adaptation to the present, it is adaptability to a future.

The characteristic of true religion is, thus, the power of unending progress. In this power of progress three elements may be distinguished:

First. The power to develop from within, with a strong and healthy growth, according to the law of its own type.

Second. The power to take up and vitally assimilate what is true and good in other religions, in philosophy, science, social movements.

Third. The power to cast off, in due time, the forms of thought, ritual or life which belong to outgrown stages of its development and have become a hindrance to further progress.

1. All these are exemplified in the history of Judaism. At the moment when the Assyrian envoys were delivering their message there stood by Hezekiah a man whose courageous faith was a surer reliance than walls and gates, the prophet Isaiah. He was one of the leaders in the prophetic movement of the eighth century whose great achievement was to establish the ethical character of true religion. The will of God is moral, *wholly* moral; what he demands of men is not worship, but uprightness, justice, kindness, tenderness of heart, faithfulness. (Hosea, ii., 19 f.) The sins which provoke God's wrath and draw down his judgment are the wrongs which men inflict upon their fellows—the great estates acquired by crushing out the free peasantry, the luxury procured by fraud and extortion, the unjust laws, the corrupt judges, the greedy and sensual priests, the prophets who say to such as do these things, "Ye shall not surely die."

The standard of right is the same among all nations, and this identity of the moral law and its sanctions leads to the unity of God. Monotheism among the Jews was not reached from the metaphysical, but from the ethical side, and it always bore the stamp of its origin in its personal and supermundane idea of God, the moral governor of the world, in the corresponding conception of sin, not as infirmity, imperfection, but as transgression of the will of God; and in the idea of salvation as conditioned by repentance and reformation and consisting in reconciliation with God. The consequences of this "ethical monotheism" were more fully developed as the generations passed, and were gradually wrought into the whole life of the people.

With all its moral strenuousness Judaism was not lacking in the mystical—or, if the word offends, spiritual—element, without which a religion cannot long satisfy the deepest needs and aspirations of the human heart. The Psalter contains

some of the immortal classics of the spirit which finds in the consciousness of God's presence and his love, of oneness of will with him, the supreme good: "Whom have I in heaven but thee, and since I have thee what need I more on earth?"

Finally, religion had for the prophets an ideal end. It is not enough that God's purpose in and for Israel be fulfilled by its becoming a righteous and godly people; God had a larger purpose. The true religion must become the universal religion; all nations shall one day know the true God and rejoice to do his will. Israel is the prophet of the true religion among the nations, its martyr, discouraged, persecuted even to death, but sure of final success.

2. Judaism showed in a no less marked degree the power to take up and assimilate religious ideas of other peoples. In the fifth and fourth centuries the Jews were brought into close contact with the Persian religion, and can hardly have failed to feel in it an affinity to their own. The "Wise Lord" Ahura Mazda, was indeed in many ways like their own Lord, Jehovah. The moral strenuousness of Mazdaism was not inferior to that of Judaism, and it lent to its law the tremendous sanctions of the hereafter, the judgment of individual souls, in which every man was strictly requited according to his deeds, the blessedness of heaven, the pains of hell, the resurrection, the final complete triumph of the good. Its angel ministers doing the Lord's will in the world, its evil spirits working ill, fell in well with the tendency of theology more and more to exalt God out of the world. Somewhat later, after the conquests of Alexander, Greek religions and philosophy began to exert upon the Jews their strong and subtle power, these also bringing a doctrine of the unity of God, of the immortality of the soul and of retribution after death. In adopting these, Judaism proved not only its hospitable mind toward the truth in other faiths, but its power to penetrate and transmute these truths by its own spirit, so that, even when we can most clearly discern their origin, they do not appear borrowed and foreign elements in the religion, but integral to it.

3. The third factor in the power of religious progress is the ability to cast off, in due time, forms and beliefs which have been outgrown. The first illustration of this which will doubtless suggest itself to all is the prophetic rejection of tangible representation of God. The holy stone or tree, the image, had once been the seat, the abode, of the deity—let us be just—the means to realize the presence of God. To the more enlightened age it was a symbol, but even as a symbol it was incongruous with a spiritual conception of God. The ark in the adytum of the temple in Jerusalem was a most holy thing in the eyes of the people; its disappearance was like the loss of a palladium. If they knew the truth, the prophet Jeremiah says, they would not lament it nor wish its restoration. When Pompey entered the holy of holies he marvelled to find it empty.

In the last centuries before our era Judaism let the name of God fall into disuse. Instead of Jehovah (*Jahvè*) they said "God" or "the Lord." Whatever other motives may have been at work, we must recognize, I think, a true religious instinct that a proper name for God is inconsistent with a monotheism; those who acknowledge but one God have no need to distinguish him by name from others. Nothing contributed more to make the spread of Judaism and of Christianity possible than that it did not come to men as one of the host of foreign mysteries of which the world was full, with a particular god of its own, but fell into line with the whole monotheistic trend of philosophic and higher religious thought in the gentile world.

Sacrifice, which could be offered only in Jerusalem, ceased to have any immediate religious value to the great multitude of the Jews in the dispersion, who visited the holy city perhaps but once or twice in their life. The synagogue was their temple, and the religious instruction of the synagogue, the reading of the Scriptures and comment on them, with the common prayer of the congregation, was their spiritual worship. By the purity of its idea of the one God who is worshipped without symbol or sacrifice, by the rational character of its synagogue

service, and by the authority of its venerable scriptures, Judaism appealed to many minds among the Gentiles, and exerted an influence far greater than the number of proselytes would indicate.

On the other hand, Judaism was cumbered with minute and burdensome observances covering the whole of life—in great part survivals from lower stages of social and religious development—which it lacked power to cast off. Nay, regarding them as positive divine ordinances, it attributed to them the greater religious value the less rational or religious they really were—they were the better test of fidelity to God's commands. The danger lay near that the tithing of mint and anise and cummin should be regarded as the weightiest matters of the law because they were the smallest, beside which truth and uprightness and goodness seemed commonplace and almost pagan virtues; just as in the Christian Church exact and minute faith in doctrinal formulas or exact observance of rites has sometimes been made of more worth than love to God or men.

In opposition to these tendencies and errors, Jesus laid the whole stress of his teaching on the spiritual and ethical in religion. The Father in Heaven as the essentially religious conception of God, love to God and our neighbor as the whole law, likeness to the heavenly father as the ideal of character, the good world in which right and love everywhere prevail as the end of individual and social life. The energy of life in these convictions, born of his own profound consciousness and experience, throws aside, not only as worthless in themselves but as a hindrance to true thinking and good living, the ceremonial observances, the trivial regulations, which seemed to the scribes so momentous. Traditions which made the word of God of none effect Jesus indignantly repudiated.

Paul, the apostle to the Gentiles, draws the final consequence; the law, as a religious institute, had in its time a pedagogic value; but it had now outlived its purpose and was to be rejected as a cumbrous survival of an economy that is

past. He preached "God in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" as a gospel of salvation.

Christianity showed from the beginning not only the power of vigorous and sound development from within and the power of this new life to throw off forms of thought and observance which were incongruous with its higher ideas and ends, but the power to think and speak in the language of the world in which it found itself and to take to itself the truth which it found in the world. The theology of Paul and John is the exposition and justification of Christianity to contemporary Greek thought. John boldly connects his interpretation with the speculations concerning the divine Word which were current in the Jewish-Alexandrian as well as in contemporary Stoic philosophy. The theologians of the early Church set themselves the task of showing that the great truths of philosophy are Christian truths—Christianity is the true philosophy—and of construing the content of Christianity in the forms of contemporary philosophy, not without change in the substance. Nor was it only philosophy which Christianity claimed as its own; it took up into itself all that was true and really living in the religions of the age and penetrated it with its own spirit. Only by so doing was its conquest of those religions possible. The pagan religions unsuccessfully imitated it in this. There is an interesting letter from the Emperor Julian to Arsacius in which he expresses the conviction that, unless the old religion can make its own the spirit of Christian charity it is doomed. In this process Christianity took over many adhering elements of paganism, and the beginning was made of a new accumulation of incongruous survivals, beliefs, rites, customs, of Greek, Roman, Teutonic origin under which, in the mediæval church, Christianity was almost buried, until the Protestant reformation, with its revival of vital religion, and more consequently the Puritan reformation, cast them off.

Thus, through all its history, this religion has shown the same capacity to develop from within, to assimilate from without, and to reject its own outgrown modes. Some ages

have been conspicuously ages of internal growth; the essential principles of religion have been worked out in thought and life; others have been times of great influence from without in both thought and life; others, still, ages of clarification and reform. But the interdependence of the factors is always clear; only the vigor of the inner growth makes assimilation safe or reform natural and real.

The signature of true religion is the power of progress, the ability to keep in the closest touch with the developing religious and moral consciousness of man, the advance in knowledge of the universe by science, and the unification and rationalization of that knowledge by philosophy, the ability to adapt itself (not by mere accommodation) to the needs of men in all stages of culture and in all the experiences of life. Its unity is not constancy to invariable type, but continuity of development.

I have made much use of the word development; I have spoken of religion as having in itself the capacity of development, and have tried to analyse this development. Such language may, however, easily be misleading. Historical development is not a mechanical or biological process. The factor of progress in history is human intelligence, conscience and will; and all great advances are made under the leadership of great men. So it is in religion. Every ethical religion was founded or reformed by a religious genius—Moses, Zoroaster, Buddha, as well as Jesus. But the very supremacy of the founder's genius, especially when associated with the idea of revelation and sacred scripture, tends to stereotype the religion and turn its face to the past instead of the future. The progress of such a religion is dependent on a succession of men who from age to age revive religion by bringing it into living interaction with the thought and conscience of their own time, and rising above their times carry forward the standard, the ideal toward which succeeding generations shall aspire and strive.

Judaism and Christianity have been remarkable for this prophetic, this true apostolic succession, men who have had the consequence and courage to cast off the encumbrance of sur-

vivals—knowing that it belongs to the prophetic office to pull down and destroy as well as to build up and to plant—and the divine insight to discern and point out the way of new advance. Very different in surroundings, gifts and character, they have been possessed by one spirit, they have, however partial their vision, always had their eyes turned to one goal. From the historian's point of view they are the bearers of the development, from the religious point of view they are the organs of one age-long divine revelation.

For God's revelation is not a thing of the remote past, ended forever when the canon of the New Testament was closed. If it had been so, the development of Christianity would have ended there; which is but another way of saying that there Christianity died—what remained was a dead religion, literally, a *superstition*.

If we believe that Christianity is the true religion, we must believe that it has still a limitless development before it, not of expansion only, but of growth from within and of adoption of truth from without; that in their time other men of the spirit, prophets as great as any whom we revere in the past, will arise to reveal the saving truths of the age.

To this progress we, who do not measure ourselves by the standard of the prophets, must dedicate our lives in the same spirit. And we shall contribute to it our best, not by striving for progress as an end in itself, but by seeking truth, right and goodness with a single eye to perceive them and a single mind to make them prevail in our lives and in the world.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.

II.

THE CONSERVATION OF OUR RESOURCES.

BY NATHAN C. SCHAEFFER, D.D., LL.D.

On May 13, 1908, there was a remarkable gathering at Washington. In the East Room of the White House were assembled the cabinet officers, the justices of the Supreme Court, members of the Senate and House of Representatives, the governors of all the States except two, and captains of industry like Andrew Carnegie and James J. Hill. The meeting was called for the purpose of starting a movement to conserve our national resources. In the opening address President Roosevelt used startling language. "The Nation," said he, "began with the belief that its landed possessions were illimitable and capable of supporting all the people who might care to make our country their home, but already the limit of unsettled land is in sight, and indeed but little land fitted for agriculture remains unoccupied save what can be reclaimed by irrigation and drainage. We began with an unapproached heritage of forests; more than half the timber is gone. We began with coal fields more extensive than those of any other nation and with iron ores regarded as inexhaustible, and many experts now declare that the end of both coal and iron is in sight."

Men of science had discussed at their associations the waste of our soil and fuel and mineral supplies, but their words were like the voice of one crying in the wilderness—no one paid any attention to the noise they were trying to make. But when the President drew attention to the necessity of conserving our resources for the benefit of future generations, the voice of conservation became the voice of the nation and arrested the attention even of the governments of Canada and Mexico.

Furthermore the conferences at the White House have given rise to literature on the conservation of our national resources that will materially modify our methods of teaching and studying geography. There are at least four points of view from which the subject may be taught and studied:

1. The elementary school seeks to impart a knowledge of the forms of land and water and of the political divisions which man has made for governmental purposes. It seeks to develop the basal concepts which enable the pupil to interpret a map, to grasp a route of travel and to understand what he reads in books, magazines and the newspapers.

2. The study of geography becomes scientific when the learner is taught things in their causes and essential relations. It is the mission of science to trace the relation of cause and effect, of reason and consequence, of law and its applications. Geography when studied from this point of view has high disciplinary value and is a fit subject for the curriculum of the high school and the college.

3. Our schools for the study of trade and commerce teach geography from still another point of view. Schools of this sort aim to familiarize the learner with the geography which bears upon his particular vocation, teaching him whence the raw materials are derived and whither the finished product must be sent so as to find a ready market.

4. In distinction from these points of view the memorable meeting at the White House emphasized the study of the earth as a fit place for the abode of man. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that it revived the method of Karl Ritter, who studied every country with reference to the resources which make it a place fit to live in. As soon as the resources of a country are exhausted, population moves elsewhere, and the locality loses its interest, geographically speaking. At one time Pithole was the next to the largest post office in Pennsylvania. To-day it is no longer on the map; only a few houses mark the site; the exhaustion of its oil field caused a migration to places better suited for making a living.

The history of the Holy Land teaches the same lesson.

Forests, woods and groves are frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, but these words do not occur in the New Testament. In Ecclesiastes (II., 6) Solomon says: "I made me pools of water, to water therewith the wood that bringeth forth trees." The Children of Israel had the purest form of religion among the nations of antiquity, but this did not save them as a nation when their material resources and the fertility of their soil began to fail. The destruction of the forests, the failure of the water supply, and the deterioration of the soil were factors as potent as the decay of religious faith.

"The surface of Palestine," says Marsch, "is composed in a great measure of rounded limestone hills, once no doubt covered with forests. These were partially removed before the Jewish Conquest. When the soil began to suffer from drought, reservoirs to contain the waters of winter were hewn in the rock near the tops of the hills and the declivities were terraced. So long as the cisterns were in good order and the terraces kept up, the fertility of Palestine was unsurpassed, but when misgovernment and foreign and intestine war occasioned the neglect or destruction of these works—traces of which still meet the eye of the traveler at every step—when the reservoirs were broken and the terrace walls had fallen down, there was no longer water for irrigation in summer, the rains of winter soon washed away most of the thin layer of earth upon the rocks, and Palestine was reduced almost to the condition of a desert."¹

It is very instructive to study from this point of view the region which was settled in colonial days by the Reformed, the Lutherans, the Mennonites and German Baptist Brethren.

Like the other early settlers of Pennsylvania they came from the best people in Europe and were noted for their piety and religious earnestness. These traits could not have laid the foundation of their subsequent prosperity, had they not settled in a region as well fitted for the abode of man as the countries from which they came. The student of geography can not find a better country to live in than the area between the

¹ Marsh's "Man and Nature," pp. 369-370.

Delaware River and the Allegheny Mountains, bounded on the north by the Blue Ridge and on the south by the Potomac River. According to the last census Lancaster County is the richest agricultural county in the United States. The great valley stretching from Easton to Harrisburg and thence to the south as the Cumberland Valley is an area that was well timbered, well watered, possessing a rich soil, a salubrious climate, and an abundance of iron ore and of the other things which contribute to health and strength and happiness. Some have regretted that the Blue Ridge does not contain any useful minerals or precious metals, but the geologist Leslie claims that one should not look so good a gift horse in the mouth. By this figure of speech he meant that the Blue Ridge condenses the vapor into rain clouds and causes a rainfall and a fertility of the land more valuable than mines of gold and silver. The streams furnished motive power for grist mills; the abundance of wood and iron ore kept the charcoal furnaces a-going, and there was plenty of anthracite nearby when the charcoal began to fail. The climate invited the farmers to practice rotation of crops; the soil is as productive to-day as it was two hundred years ago. The denominations which care for the religious faith of the people settled in this region will have a future worthy of their past history.

The automobile and Sunday baseball have not diminished the attendance at their churches; race suicide has not diminished their population; the richness of the soil and the abundance of other resources will always sustain a thriving yeomanry upon the farms. Their houses look as if the inhabitants meant to stay. Their dialect may die out, but the people will perpetuate themselves, their prosperity and their religious faith so long as their resources, their institutions and the fertility of the soil can be kept up. To the inhabitants of this region the recent appeal for the improvement of country life had little meaning, and the President's plea for the conservation of our resources seemed needless. It is necessary to take a more comprehensive view in order to feel the need of the movement for conservation.

Man can live forty days without food, four days without water, and not four minutes without air. Air, food and water may sustain life in tropical countries, but in the temperate zone man needs also fuel and shelter, clothing and building materials. From the air, the water, the soil, the forest and the mine he gets what he needs for food, for raiment, for houses and for his industrial life. The sea furnishes less than five per cent. of our food supply; the fish which were once so abundant in our streams that apprentices stipulated they should not be given shad more than twice a week and the game in our forests which was plentiful enough to sustain the life of the first settlers, must now be left out of the account in estimating the real sources of our food supply. Fortunately the American people grow more than they eat; but how will it be when two hundred million people will have to be fed? An area sufficient to sustain a population of ten millions can be reclaimed by irrigation and drainage, but the bulk of the people will have to be sustained upon the soil now under cultivation. At the close of the Civil War it was not unusual to hear people say and sing that Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm. To-day the lands open to homesteaders cover a comparatively small area. The land suited for raising corn has all been taken, and the British territory fit for growing wheat which unlike corn does not need warm nights to ripen, is now attracting the pioneers who are seized with the lust for land.

Are the American people getting the best return from the soil which they till? Listen to the words of an expert. In no other important country in the world, with the exception of Russia," says James J. Hill, "is the industry that must be the foundation of every state, at so low an ebb as in our own. According to the last census the average annual product per acre of the farms of the whole United States was worth \$11.38. It is little more than a respectable rental in communities where the soil is properly cared for and made to give a reasonable return for cultivation. There were but two states in the union whose total value of farm products was over \$30 per acre of improved land. The great state of Illinois gave but \$12.48, and

Minnesota showed only \$8.74. No discrimination attaches to these figures where all are so much at fault. Nature has given to us the most valuable possession ever committed to man. It can never be duplicated because there is none like it upon the face of the earth. And we are racking and impoverishing it exactly as we are felling the forests and rifling the mines. Our soil, once the envy of every other country, the attraction which draws millions of immigrants across the seas, gave an average yield for the whole United States during the ten years beginning with 1896 of 13.5 bushels of wheat per acre. Austria and Hungary each produced over 17 bushels per acre, France 19.8, Germany 27.6 and the United Kingdom 32.2 bushels per acre. For the same decade our average yield of oats was less than 30 bushels, while Germany produced 46 and Great Britain 42. For Barley the figures are 25 against 33 and 34.6; for rye 15.4 against 24 for Germany and 26 for Ireland. In the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands and Denmark a yield of more than thirty bushels of wheat per acre was the average for the past five years."

The discouraging part of the comparison is that the yield per acre is actually diminishing. The authority just quoted says: "The average yield of wheat per acre in New York for the last ten years was about 18 bushels. For the first five years of that ten-year period it was 18.4 bushels, and for the last five 17.4 bushels. In the farther West, Kansas takes high rank as a wheat producer. Its average yield per acre for the last ten years was 14.6 bushels. For the first five years it was 15.4 and for the last five 13.18. Up in the Northwest, Minnesota wheat has made a name all over the world. Her average yield per acre for the same ten years was 12.96 bushels. For the first five years it was 13.12 and for the last five 12.8. We perceive here the working of a uniform law, independent of location, soil or climate. It is the law of a diminishing return due to soil destruction. Apply this to the country at large, and it reduces agriculture to the conditions of a bank whose depositors are steadily drawing out more than they put in."

It takes ten thousand years for nature to make a foot of soil and careless farming may ruin it in ten years. Three processes are clearly visible, soil exhaustion, soil erosion, soil destruction by mining and other operations. "When our soils are gone, we too must go unless some way is found to feed on raw rock or its equivalent." Single cropping and no fertilization are not the only factors that conspire to destroy the soil. Erosion and soil wash are equally destructive. Every time a heavy rain falls, the streams grow muddy, which means that soil is being carried off to the mouth of rivers, forming deltas to obstruct navigation. The Secretary of the Inland Waterways Commission estimates that over a billion tons of our richest soil, valued at not less than a billion dollars, is annually washed away to clog our rivers and harbors. That amount represents about half a ton per acre, or if placed in one pile would make a block a mile square and a thousand feet high.

Mining and manufacturing operations also help to ruin the soil. "At Ducktown, Tennessee, the fumes of SO_2 from the roasting and smelting of the copper ores," says President Bogert of the American Chemical Society, "together with flue dust have killed all vegetation for miles around, and the land thus denuded has eroded with startling rapidity." The Secretary of Agriculture cites it as a striking illustration of the completeness of destruction that may result from erosion in this region when the protecting forest is once removed." Another authority states that there are localities where one tenth of the arable land has been destroyed by erosion. Mining operations have destroyed entire valleys. The greed of this generation will surely inflict suffering upon our descendants.

Fifty years ago Lord Macauley used these words: "As long as you have a boundless extent of fertile and unoccupied land your laboring population will be found more at ease than the laboring population of the Old World, but the time will come when the wages will be as low and will fluctuate as much as they do with us. Then your institutions will be brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous

and discontented, and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him that it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million and another can not get a full meal. . . . The day will come when the multitudes of people none of whom has had more than half a breakfast or expects more than half a dinner, will choose a legislature. Is it possible to doubt what sort of a legislature will be chosen. . . . Either civilization or liberty will perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand or your republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire in the fifth."

The observance of Arbor Day has made the average reader familiar with the rate at which our forests are disappearing. Every year we cut three times as much timber as the growth of our forests, and it is predicted that in twenty years our people will begin to feel the effects of a lumber famine.

Since 1880 the total cut is estimated to be more than 700 billion feet, enough to make a floor one inch thick over Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Delaware, an area of 25,000 square miles. What this will ultimately mean to our civilization no one ventures to predict.

The nations which have iron and coal now rule the world. This explains the power and supremacy of the United States. When the republic was founded there were in the present area of the United States exclusive of Alaska and our colonial possessions ten billion tons of iron ore, two trillion tons of coal, 850 millions acres of forest, and an amount of petroleum and natural gas impossible to estimate. Writers applied the word inexhaustible to our resources of iron, coal, wood and other forms of fuel. The quantities were so enormous that the mind ordinarily conceives of them as a mere row of figures. The devices of the school master must be employed to give an adequate idea of what these figures mean. Take the coal mined in a single day. If loaded on trains of cars with fifty tons in each car and thirty cars to a train, the combined length of trains would encircle the globe at the equator two and

two third times. Every year we cut enough timber to cover with a floor an inch thick the entire area of Vermont, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Rhode Island and Delaware, and we destroy by fire as much timber as we use. Since the annual cut is three times the annual growth, it is predicted by experts that the American people will begin to feel the effects of a timber famine in twenty years. Andrew Carnegie predicts that by 1937 one eighth of the available iron ore will have been used. Our methods of coal mining waste a large amount of coal—in some instances one half of the available supply. "Of all the sinful wasters of man's inheritance on earth," said the late Professor Shaler, "and all are in this regard sinners, the very worst are the people of America." In no respect is this so true as in the lavish waste of natural gas, "the purest form of fuel, ideal in every respect, self transporting, only awaiting the turning of a key to deliver to our homes and factories, heat, light and power." Professor White, the state geologist of West Virginia, estimates from personal knowledge of the conditions which exist in every oil and gas field that not less than a billion cubic feet of gas go to waste daily, this waste being equal to a million bushels of coal. He claims that the tonnage originating in the Pittsburg district and passing through it now exceeds that of the four greatest seaport cities of the world, London, New York, Liverpool and Hamburg combined, and that if the wasteful methods of the past are to continue, if the flames of 35,000 coke ovens are to continue to make the sky lurid within sight of the city of Pittsburg, consuming with frightful speed one third of the power and one half of the values locked in her supplies of coaking coal, the present century will see the end of this supremacy.

The most alarming feature in this waste is the fact that coal and iron when once mined can never be replaced in the bowels of the earth. We seem to be facing a period when our supplies of fuel and iron will be exhausted. It is indeed hard to conceive the readjustments which will be necessary in our mode of living after we begin to feel a scarcity in these sources

of daily comfort and national greatness. We do not build a house nor construct a bridge nor cook a meal nor operate a machine without using iron, wood, coal or other forms of fuel. Modern warfare, modern industry and modern methods of transportation would be impossible without iron and steel and coal or other fuel.

In view of these facts and predictions shall man grow pessimistic over his future? In Iceland where no supplies of coal and iron are found and where nothing bigger than a birch can grow (it seems to be heaven ordained that a birch should grow wherever a boy can grow) the people have attained a high state of culture and a rare appreciation of the things of the mind and the higher life, but the civilized races of the temperate zone will never be satisfied to live the life of the people of Iceland, if inventive skill can find substitutes for fuel and iron. The application of science to art will in due time solve the problem. Ages ago sunlight was stored for the use of man in the three states of matter. Coal and wood are sunlight in solid form. Petroleum is sunlight stored in liquid form. Natural gas is sunlight in the third state of matter. The sun motor is still in operation. On a clear day heat equal to 7,500 horse power is poured upon every square acre of the earth's surface. It is possible to concentrate this heat as in the Portuguese priest's heliophore at the St. Louis Exposition, which produced a temperature of 6,000 degrees Fahrenheit—"a heat in which the most solid steel melted like a snow ball in a Bessemer Converter."

Even if there should continue to be difficulty in the direct utilization of the sun's rays, the indirect use is in sight. Carry a bucket of water to the top of a building and in pouring it upon the earth you liberate as much power as was consumed in carrying the water to that elevation. The sun is constantly lifting vapor into the sky which falls as rain, giving rise to streams, waterfalls and motive power far in excess of the power locked in our fuel.

It is estimated that it would take all the coal mined in a year to pump back the water which tumbles over Niagara in

twenty-four hours. The time will come when all our rivers will be utilized for motive power and when every rivulet on the farm will be made to generate electricity for lighting, heating and motive power. In his desire to quantify everything, the scientist has calculated the quantity of rain which falls upon the surface of the earth. Including both land and water areas the total rainfall is estimated at 215 trillion cubic feet. Of this total over half is evaporated; about a third flows into the sea; the remaining sixth is either consumed or absorbed. The theoretical power of the streams is 230 million horse power, of which the amount now in use is 5,250,000 horse power. The amount available is estimated at 37 million horse power which exceeds our entire mechanical power and would "operate every mill, drive every spindle, propel every train and boat, and light every city, town and village in the land."

The age of transportation by inland canals is evidently just dawning. The lessened cost of shipping merchandise by water would have saved consumers and manufacturers a sum in excess of \$250,000,000 as compared with the cost of transportation by rail. Nevertheless the canals which cost Pennsylvania upwards of fifty million dollars and were sold for about six million dollars, have been allowed to fall into ruin and decay—another example of sinful waste on the part of the American people. Much has been done to check the waste of our national resources and to restore our soil and our forests. The land-grant colleges, the public schools and public officials, from the governors of our Western States down to the itinerant lecturer, are advocating rotation of crops, better methods of farming and intelligent systems of forestry. Millions of trees are planted on every Arbor Day. Almost a million acres have been set apart for forestry in the Keystone State. New York leads us in this movement. Even Yale University has planted a school of forestry in Pike County—that is on Pennsylvania soil. We support a school of our own in Franklin County. Any person riding on the train from Philadelphia to Pittsburg must have noticed the thousands of trees which

the Pennsylvania Railroad has planted in the hope that the growth will furnish the cross-ties which will be needed to repair its tracks.

By a decision of the Supreme Court of Maine the cutting of lumber owned by private parties can now be regulated by judicious and wise legislation.

There is difference of opinion with reference to President Roosevelt's services upon political matters. There can be no difference of opinion as to his service in the conservation of our national resources. When he took the office of President, our timber, our minerals, our coal in all the eastern and central parts of the United States had passed into private hands. A beginning had been made of the reservation of the forests of the west before President Roosevelt's time, but during his administration practically all of the great forests of the west which still remained have been withdrawn from public entry and remain the property of the nation. Not only so, but the mineral fuel also is no longer subject to entry but remains subject to the nation. And following these two great acts he took up the question with Congress, with the governors, with the people as to the conservation of all our resources, both those in public and those in private lands. "I believe," says President Van Hise, "that the work which the President has done in this matter will among future generations mark him as not only one of the greatest statesmen of this nation, but of all nations in all time."

At this point we may allow our imagination to reënforce our hopes. The new knowledge which science is evolving, is furnishing gleams of hope in new directions. The very language as well as the concepts which have been evolved from discoveries in the last six years are so new that one can scarcely talk so as to be understood unless he be endowed with gifts like those of Helmholtz, Tyndall and Huxley. In discussing intra-atomic energy Professor Duncan says that March, 1903, is a date to which in all probability the men of the future will often refer as the veritable beginning of the larger powers and energies which they will control. It was in March, 1903,

that Curie and Laborde announced the heat-emitting power of radium.

More recently Ramsey announced the transmutation of copper into lithium, which, if true, realizes the dream of the alchemists. Recently Dr. Comstock announced the discovery that matter and energy are distinct entities. More recently Mr. Baker announced a new method for restoring exhausted soils.

Professor Duncan in his book on the New Knowledge predicts the end of coal-mining. "It is impossible," he says, "for us to come to any other conclusion than that there is locked up in all the so-called elements of matter an enormous store of energy which, except in those elements of heaviest atomic weight like radium and thorium, remains latent and unknown. Professor Thomson, as the result of his calculations, concludes that a gram of hydrogen has within it energy sufficient to lift a million tons through a height considerably exceeding one hundred yards; and that since the amount of energy is proportional to the number of corpuscles composing the atom of the element, the energy of the other elements such as sulphur, iron or lead must enormously exceed this amount. "We have already shown," says he, "that Professor Thomson's calculations have a habit of squaring with fact. The energy whence we obtain our manufacturing power, whether derived from burning coal or gas or any other chemical reaction, depends upon the action of one system of atoms upon another. It is absolutely insignificant compared with the limitless energy locked up within the atoms themselves. We know that this energy exists, but to-day we have no control over it. We can neither let it loose nor tie it up in any way whatever. We can only observe it. But it would be rash indeed to predict that our impotence will last forever. Strange things happen nowadays and yet stranger things may, nay will, be seen by future men. We have no real warranty that this infinity of energy will be tapped by man, except this, that what man earnestly longs for he will obtain. If he knows that every breath of air he draws has contained within itself power enough to drive

the workshops of the world, he will find out some day, somehow, some way of tapping that energy. . . . It has been playfully suggested by Rutherford that some day it might be possible to construct a detonator which would send a wave of atomic disintegration through the earth and decompose the whole round world into helium, argon and other gases, leaving literally not one stone upon another. Without being frightened by any such humorous suggestion as this, we can easily grant that with the continuous acceleration of scientific research where one year of the present counts for a cycle of former time, there will come a day in the unending succession of days when men will look with mingled horror and amusement at the burning of coal and wood, and will date the coming in of their kingdom to the time when Curie and Laborde demonstrated the existence and extent of intra-atomic energy."²

This brings us to the most terrible of all the wastes of our day. In 1907 9,000 persons were killed and wounded in the mines. The waste of human life in our mines, in our factories, upon our railroads, is a destruction greater than that of any battle in modern times—and alongside of this is another fearful waste, the waste of brains through child labor and imperfect methods of education.

Sir Humphrey Davy says that the greatest discovery which he ever made, was when he discovered Michael Faraday. The best asset which our nation has, is children, and yet children are stunted in their growth by methods of work in the mine and the factory and by faulty methods of education and living which send thousands to an early grave and prevent tens of thousands from attaining the complete development of all their powers. The most thrilling book I ever read is Cobden's book on White Slavery in England, which tells how, in the days when the Arkwrights and the Peels piled up colossal fortunes upon the underpaid toil of women and children, little children were obliged to get up before daylight to pull bunkers through coal shafts too small for a mule to pass through. The brightest page of English history tells how, since 1802, Parlia-

² Duncan's "New Knowledge," pp. 176-178.

ment has passed one act after another to put an end to this slavery of children and women. The laws of nearly all the states now seek to protect childhood from work in mines and factories which is calculated to stunt their growth. We have laws that compel children to go to school and other laws which keep them out of school and out of work until the age of sixteen, and by that time we have made them criminals if they neither work nor study.

I begin to think that the mother who raises a family of children and trains them for useful citizenship does far more for our country and for humanity than the man who piles up millions and alongside of the millions practices race suicide. In a word science requires well-educated, fully developed men and women if our resources known and unknown shall be conserved and used for the highest welfare of humanity.

Religion is needed to curb the sinful transgressions which do so much to deteriorate the vigor and vitality of the human race. A sense of man's relation to his maker will always be needed to strengthen his conceptions of duty and to elevate his ideals and hopes. Without material resources the race will die from hunger and starvation, without religion the children of men will perish through sin and transgression and iniquity. The home, the school, the church and the state should work in harmony to preserve our national resources and to perpetuate our moral vigor for the benefit of the generations that are still unborn.

III.

THE LEGACY LEFT US BY DARWIN AND HIS COLLABORATORS.¹

JOHN M. MACFARLANE, PH.D.

Professor of Botany, University of Pennsylvania.

I am deeply sensible of the honor your society has done me, in asking me, through your learned member, Professor Schiedt, to speak now on the naturalist and philosopher, Charles Darwin. My sense of high responsibility is coupled with the grateful remembrance that I can regard him as a fellow countryman; as one who—like his father and grandfather before him—was student in a common Alma Mater, Edinburgh University; as an illustrious discoverer in my chosen field of natural science; and as the man who had opened wide vistas of biological study to our student-day eyes, vistas these that have ever lengthened with the passing years.

Student days always recall fond memories, and they again insensibly lead us back to pre-student enthusiasms and hopes. So there rises before me the picture of a group of lads in my native town, sixteen to twenty years old, who were striving to reach out, even to the most momentous and intricate questions of the universe. It is appropriate that youthful hopes and youthful wisdom go hand in hand, for in time the increase in the latter helps to decrease the former, and so life's mean is struck though it may be after many years.

But wisdom after all, like each phenomenon of this world, is a relative quantity. So every one of our score or thereby of young aspirants to knowledge, entered with hearty good will

¹ Delivered before the Linnean Society, the faculty and students of Franklin and Marshall College, and citizens of Lancaster, Pa., February 27, 1909.

into the exercises of our "Mutual Improvement Society." And our young lives had been flung forth into the world's arena at an epoch-making age. For had not "The Vestiges of the Natural History of Creation" stirred deepest thoughts and apprehensions in parental minds; had not Spencer's "Social Statics" been read and pondered by our elders for twenty years; had not "The Origin of Species" seemed to upset all traditions; had not "The Descent of Man" but recently appeared and called forth magazine articles that we followed with avidity, if not always with appreciation? The debates in that little society, for and against evolution, often waxed hot and eloquent, were supposedly settled by a vote of the assembled members before each meeting broke up, but anew were reopened as we scattered to our homes, and scarcely were they settled when our heads settled on our pillows for the night.

Later years at college only served to emphasize the ferment that was working in the human mind. For while the genial and able Wyville Thompson had left his classes, to conduct scientifically the "Challenger" expedition round the world, his place had been taken temporarily by Huxley, whose long raven hair in heavy locks, broad-spread nose, searching eyes, set mouth and mellow fluent "catching" diction all "caught" the students. Little wonder was it then that on Sir Wyville's triumphant return, with the treasures of a world's ocean-depths in his keeping, even he failed to recapture the errant ones, nay rather had in time to follow his young inexperienced but wayward flock in their evolutionary wanderings.

During the nine hours of the college day we might stray into one class room to hear diatribes against all who would even suggest that species were mutable, into another where a younger teacher would hail "Darwinism" as the new scientific salvation, into still another where gentle sarcasm was heaped on all Darwinian followers. But the new creed had come to stay for us, and therefore we at one time ran, at another time stumbled on, and failing either, groped forward where we could not see to follow.

You will pardon these personal reminiscences when I say that they represented the average university as well as lay attitude toward evolutionary teachings from 1860 to 1880.

Today how great is the contrast! During the past weeks and months, as well as in those that are to come, an international tribute to the genius of Darwin, and so of all associated with him in building up the great doctrine of evolution, has been and will be offered that will probably remain unequaled in the history of any one man. This evening we have gathered to attest our interest in the man, in the cause and in the issues of that cause for humanity. Therefore it is that I have chosen to speak on "The Legacy Left us by Darwin and His Collaborators."

In family or in social affairs, a legacy may represent varied interests or commodities; land, houses, money, jewels, or special investments amongst others. Not less varied is the evolutionary legacy. Contrast the material, the mental, the moral, the spiritual horizons of 1859, when "The Origin of Species" appeared, with those now surrounding us a half century later. We would at once boldly assert that the advance has been remarkable. But we would also suggest that in some relations stagnation or retrogression has occurred.

In the material and the mental, a progressive evolution has been effected, whose magnitude we often scarcely estimate aright, because we live amid its highest results. The material advance is due to that happy combination of manifold discoveries in pure chemistry and physics, with direct application of these in the arts and sciences, so as to increase human well-being and human wealth. But in part, at least, this advance has resulted from a correlated, orderly, scientific mode of approaching these subjects, which may well be called the evolutionary method; or in other words, observation, analysis, synthesis and deduction have gone hand in hand. The inventors of earliest days had it, but to them it was a happy and often haphazard combination, not an accepted rule of conduct as now.

As regards mental relations and viewpoints the change has been phenomenal. In 1859 living things, and man himself, were regarded as separate entities, each species being blocked off by hard and fast lines from others of more or less near affinity. "The proper study of Mankind is Man" had been so dwelt on and hackneyed that knowledge of the mental attitudes of lower animals was scant and erratic in the extreme, while plants were viewed as living things only in a distant sense, and as mainly worthy of study from their economic relations, or as ministering to man's sense of the beautiful. Abstract philosophy, classical linguistics and mathematics held the field, but only in occasional cases held the men who thought of a university course. Medical science alone practiced true methods of study—though in rather imperfect manner—and had sheltered under its protective wing botany and zoölogy, the two great sciences of which medicine was only and is now a very limited department. Naturalists were almost wholly engaged in classification efforts, while morphologists and physiologists were making strong but restricted efforts to expand. Finally the church, of every sect, denomination, creed or connection, required implicit trust in its tenets, no matter how it viewed problems of life or of human development. Each individual was thus made a link in a system of thinking, acting, speaking, that gave small opportunity for individual opinion and still smaller scope for the expression by individuals of new and wide views concerning cosmic origin or modification.

The changed result of today, while powerfully heralded by Lamarck, was begun when Lyell published his "Principles of Geology" in 1833, Chambers his "Vestiges of Creation" in 1844, Spencer his "Principles of Psychology" and "Principles of Biology" from 1855 to 1866, and Darwin his "Origin of Species" in 1859. Such works, published almost within a quarter of a century, and each viewing cosmic and biologic phenomena from standpoints as different as were their authors in personal characteristics, could not fail to awaken wide interest in the minds of the laity and did not fail to excite hostile demonstration in every section of the church.

The rapid spread and acceptance of many of the more pronounced views amongst thinking people, and even by minds like those of Kingsley, Maurice, Tennyson and Fiske, soon indicated the trend of events, though one may say that it was a return to and homage paid to the prophetic scientific insight of the poet Goethe. But the mental and hereditary convictions of centuries could not readily be thrown aside unless by abundant illustration and proof drawn from every source. In furnishing this through full forty years of patient labor, Charles Darwin towered head and shoulders above his most illustrious contemporaries. While we regard it as proved that some of the widest generalizations to which he attached prime importance—as for example, natural selection—pale in fundamental value before Lamarck's environmental or direct variation factor, it nevertheless remains true that the sum total of his reconstructive work caused us to view, not merely plants and animals, but all scientific questions from an altered standpoint. And so we justly honor him to-day with richest homage.

Throughout this period of mental stress and strain, we can clearly recognize three groups of collaborators, who may be said to have worked on three successively ascending planes of evolutionary action, that carry us from the evolving inorganic and organic planes, to the higher and more humanistic realms of morals and religion.

First Darwin, as well as his co-worker and henchman, Huxley, resembled Lamarck in that they so largely concentrated attention on organic evolution, up to the stage of man's commencing civilization, that they largely laid aside any serious attempt to estimate man from his moral and religious side. True, Darwin in his "Descent of Man" touched questions of deepest import, and at times followed them to a high plane; while Huxley in some of his later essays, even carried the stage further. Darwin's final position on questions of religion is quite correctly summed up by him in 1876. "The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I for one must be content to remain an agnostic." This is the at-

titude of a humble learner whose knowledge is as nothing alongside the unfathomed truths of the universe. It is also, as his son and biographer clearly points out, in striking contrast to the avowed atheist's "I-know-everything" attitude, that is as unscientific as it is withering to further investigation.

It is wholly due to this last attitude that many during the past half century have resolved by word and action to abide on the plane of the present and the past, of man's history, instead of attempting to reach out to a higher and a nobler ideal. Stagnation and degeneration are ever present results in the life history of every organism if the environment be created that will favor their progress. So we believe that in some cases the past half century has brought individual retrogression.

But secondly, during the period under review three other minds—not to mention additional contributory ones,—were active, and two especially were attempting far wider incursions into the evolutionary field of the world. Herbert Spencer, Alfred R. Wallace and Ernest Haeckel availed themselves gladly of the teachings of Lamarck and of Darwin, while the first and last pushed their studies back to the origin, constitution and motions of unicellular organisms, of the molecules of which these consisted, of the energy and the matter that were invariably correlated in the molecules and even in the case of the first and last named, they have attempted to reach the great first causes of the world or of the universe. All three moreover have striven to picture or to follow man's evolution to still higher planes of perfection. So Herbert Spencer, in his "Principles" of Biology, of Psychology, or Sociology and of Ethics, constructed a system that if not sound in all of its generalizations, is at least imposing in its magnitude.

Wallace, soon after publication of the "Descent of Man" diverged in friendly spirit from some of Darwin's conclusions. Reflecting on man's marked superiority over the highest apes, he could not accept it that continuous evolutionary adaptation and selection had produced such a result; rather that

by some discontinuous process high mental endowment had resulted that made him in very deed "Lord of Creation." In line with this he has since been a constant advocate for the rights, the improvement and the peace of mankind, by socialistic or coöperative effort. Even though in his advocacy of spiritualism, we may join with many in saying "not proven," our profound ignorance of many unseen forces should cause us to welcome him as an investigator in that field, until its scientific value has been proved or disproved.

But of the three, Haeckel, brilliant though steady, daring yet to some degree cautious, generalizing stupendously though busy analytically, from 1865 up to our own day, has swept the gamut of speculation and deduction in a sublime—some might say in a rash—manner. No one can read his Altenburg address of 1892 on Monism, without being impressed by the determined earnestness, the eloquent presentation, the lofty aspiration and the almost prophetic faith that animate the whole and that bind together its sentences. Those closing words are impressive: "In the hope that the defence and promotion of these may still be continued, I conclude my monistic Confession of Faith with the words: 'May God the Spirit of the Good, the Beautiful and the True be with us.'"

The latter part of the past half century has produced a third group of investigators who have fully realized the value and applicability of evolution to man, as to the rest of the organic world, but who have been profoundly impressed by the religious factor in man's recent and highest progress. They have largely shared the fate of those who try to reconcile opposing forces. For it is safe to say that Drummond, Kidd and Chamberlain have been viewed with mistrust and suspicion by the church at the same time that they have been severely left alone by most biologists.

All three have presented facts of suggestive value, they have largely disentangled themselves from dogma and unverifiable assertions, they have tried to view man in process of evolution during recent millenia and have tried to forecast his continued

evolution to higher planes. Their volumes are stimulating, elevating, original, yet, though they have been widely read and reflected on, they seem as yet to have failed in reaching a suitable niche within evolution's mental temple. We need not stay to ask whether this is the fault of the men, of their views or of scientific opinion in relation to these.

In what follows it will be our endeavor to try to estimate the methods, the aims and the accomplishments of the three groups of men thus briefly outlined.

Charles Darwin belonged to the first of the three, but he occupies preëminent and unquestioned position. Spencer had already outlined, in thought at least, many of his subsequent volumes when "The Origin of Species" appeared; but he gladly testified that Darwin had been his great illuminator. Even though, as by Huxley and Haeckel, increasing prominence was given by some to environment, with resulting direct or exact variation, as a factor that at least equaled or excelled natural selection in importance, the position of Darwin has not been questioned and needs no vindication. This is due we believe in large measure to the following causes.

First, during his entire public career of exactly half a century (1831-1881) he was a continuous, devoted and simple-minded observer and interpreter of nature in its widest aspects. He lived John Burroughs' verses:

I stay my haste, I make delays,
For what avails this eager pace;
I stand amid the eternal ways,
And what is mine shall know my face.

The stars come nightly to the sky,
The tidal wave unto the sea,
Nor time, nor space, nor deep, nor high,
Can keep my own away from me.

This sentiment is reëchoed with fervid enthusiasm by Haeckel, in the closing chapters of his "Riddle of the Universe" as being the only pathway to truth and knowledge. Neatly also the *Times* wrote, on the day that Darwin was carried to West-

minster: "He thought, and his thoughts have passed into the substance of facts of the universe. A grass plot, a plant in bloom, a human gesture, the entire circle of the doings and tendencies of nature, builds his monument and records his exploits." The secluded quietness of Down became for forty years his focal centre for such "nature study." But a spirit like his could not be chained by time or place, and so the plant and animal surroundings of his summer homes, Kew or Edinburgh Botanic Gardens, the nurseries of England, the fields and forests of the United States and Brazil as seen through the eyes of two of his unseen friends, the gardens and the mountains of the European mainland were all laid under tribute.

In such observings he retained to a marked degree the open unbiased mind, though he naïvely confesses that, like all of us, he at times inclined to allow his preconceived notions—his dogmatics—to run ahead of his judgment. Witness his confession of how, on first reflection, he deemed it unnecessary for the Venus' flytrap leaf to close its spikes rather loosely after first contraction, and to tighten up by degrees, but how nature caused him to reverse his judgment after continued watching. His books abound with such illustrations.

In common with his collaborators, he rightly revolted against the view that man alone possesses all the superior gifts of mind and reason. Thus in a letter of 1886 to Asa Gray he says: "The coolness with which" the reviewer "makes all animals to be destitute of reason is simply absurd." In this connection he was probably the first naturalist who showed the essentially degraded, narrow and egotistic attitude that man had taken to natural objects below him. It was eminently appropriate then, that *he* should have demonstrated how even the poet in his flight of fancy had erred in exclaiming "Full many a flower is born to blush unseen, and waste its sweetness on the desert air," when the discriminating eye of discriminating insects had so often flitted around these, ages before man's appearance on earth, and that beneficent results should thereby have come alike to flowers and insects.

A second and equally noteworthy quality was his method of acquiring facts. Even had he only lived to teach mankind this, he would well have deserved the appellation "The Interpreter of Nature." Take any one of his dynamic works, in which he carries us stage by stage through the history of a large related group. Take for example his "Climbing Plants." Note how at one time he gathers great bodies of observed facts that suggest some movements in common, as well as peculiarities in these movements that differ. Note how he experiments by retarding the motion at one time, by reversing it at another, by making environmental agents like too thick a stick prove a hindrance rather than a help to upward climbing. Proceeding thus, he accumulates observations and experiments that become simultaneously indicative, cross questioning and excluding. By the exercise of that process which Haeckel in his "Wonders of Life" has well expressed as "a preponderant tendency to and capacity for a comprehensive perception of the universal in particulars," and which he has well remarked is combined with the above analytical capacity "only in natural philosophers of the first rank," Darwin then proceeds to deduce fundamental principles that enable us to perceive how widespread is the phenomenon of revolving motion, and even that this may be an evolved and modified expression of simpler swaying from side to side.

Similar accumulation of evidence, sifting of it, turning over even of a piece that may seem doubtfully to deserve a place in the mental rubbish pile, but that possibly has some truth in it, the massing of the whole into a great body of evidence, and the deduction therefrom of some far-reaching principle or law, characterize his "Insectivorous Plants," his "Forms of Flowers" and other works, but find highest expression in his largest and most celebrated publications.

We claim it therefore as one of his preëminent merits, that he has taught two generations of workers, in various fields of natural science, to garner and to marshal facts that will unravel many of the most complicated inter-relations of plant

and animal life. Even where such results have weakened some of his conclusions or have favored evolutionary developments that he viewed with doubt, he it was who taught the best methods by which such might be attained. Thus the studies of Lesage and Lothelier on the direct action of environment, in bringing about fundamental changes in the tissues even of the first generation of plants experimented with, formed a welcome and exact confirmation of the truth of Lamarck's teachings. The two experimenters followed the Darwinian method to verify Lamarckian results. Similarly, and in recent years, the patient, far-reaching experiments, observations and deductions of DeVries on the evening primroses have been reached by the exercise of like methods. For as one stands amid the many demarcated and carefully guarded plots in the Amsterdam Botanic Garden one vividly realizes that it is a descendant, so to say, of that at Down, where Darwin spent so many hours of his outdoor life.

Another legacy that we owe in large measure to Darwin is, that even the most startling and unlooked for combinations may occur in nature. Here it should be said that Darwin had two forerunners, alike in method and in interpretation whose greatness has only been properly gaged within the past half century. The Swiss naturalists, Huber, lived amid their bees and ants. The son especially watched the ants so closely, lived in the fields or on the hill-sides amongst them and so truthfully interpreted their life relations that his little book reads like a fairy tale. But his facts were largely laughed at by the wise ones of his day. The writer well remembers, as a young man, asking for the book at the library of his Alma Mater. A little faded volume was brought, that the librarian wiped and beat the dust from, while he remarked as he handed it "that at least has not been a popular book." Today we honor the observer as well as his accurate observations and deductions. Darwin utilized Huber's wisdom to the utmost, and turned to the ant for information. But in a letter he reveals how even he could scarcely outlive the narrow man-centered

views of nature. He says "I have just forwarded two most extraordinary letters to Busk, from a backwoodsman in Texas who has evidently watched ants carefully, and declares most positively that they plant and cultivate a kind of grass for store food and plant other bushes for shelter! I do not know what to think, except that the old gentleman is not fibbing intentionally." Darwin lived to accept this as fact, while the more wonderful culture of food-fungi by the ants amid decaying leaves, as patiently traced by Möller in Brazil, carries the wonder almost to a human plane of reasoning.

But though the above constitute valuable legacies from Darwin, the great laws that he so skillfully traced out and elaborated are a lasting monument. The final placing on a satisfactory footing of the law of variation; the application to all organisms of the great Malthusian law of Selective Survival; the far-reaching application of his law that "Nature abhors perpetual self-fertilization"; his contributions to hybridization, to geographical distribution, to digestive action, to intercellular propagation of stimulus, to irritable movements in plants, to coloration relations in plants and animals, as well as many other branches of study, are as varied and valuable as were the fields wide, in which these studies were collected.

That he effected reconciliations and joined groups of workers hand in hand who formerly were isolated, has been exquisitely worded by my departed friend, Dr. Maxwell Masters, who says: "Let any one who knows what was the state of botany in this country even so recently as fifteen or twenty years ago compare the feeling between botanists and horticulturists at that time with what it is now. What sympathy had the one for the pursuits of the other. The botanist looked down on the varieties, the races, and strains, raised with so much pride by the patient skill of the florist, as on things unworthy of his notice and study. The horticulturist, on his side, knowing how very imperfectly plants could be studied from the mummified specimens in herbaria, which then constituted

in most cases all the material that the botanist of this country considered necessary for the study of plants, naturally looked on the botanist somewhat in the light of a laborious trifler. Both classes carried on their investigations in a narrow spirit of isolation, unconscious or unheedful of the assistance that either might give to the other.

The investigations of Gaertner, of Kölreuter, of Sprengel, of Vaucher, had been allowed to remain by British naturalists as so many dead letters. It was a chance if a page or two were devoted to them in text-books; rarely if ever were they mentioned in lectures, still more rarely was their bearing on horticulture alluded to.

Darwin, by his renewal and extension of these experiments, and especially by his deductions from them, altered all this. He made the dry bones live; he invested plants and animals with a history, a biography, a genealogy, which at once conferred an interest and a dignity on them. Before, they were as the stuffed skin of a beast in the glass case of a museum; now they are living beings, each in their degree affected by the same circumstances that affect ourselves and swayed, *mutatis mutandis*, by like feelings and like passions."

But it is unquestionably true that Darwin never realized how far-reaching, how precise, how rapid in action and how varied are the forces of environment, nor how exactly organisms often respond if environmental change be made. His candor and love of the truth would have led him willingly to accept it, we believe, as new years brought added and diverse evidence.

Like all preceding naturalists of philosophic mind, he was deeply impressed by heredity as witnessed in the unending procession of plants and animals. They might migrate, they might vary, they might be in large measure swept from the field of time, but those surviving showed a precision of inheritance from the parent forms, that was as profoundly suggestive as it seemed profoundly puzzling. To him a tangled puzzle of nature was that which had to be unraveled. A

friend stood near Huxley, full thirty years ago, patiently endeavoring to untie the knot of a book package. In a moment the great biologist's knife was out, the string was cut, and the remark was dropped, "Life is too short for the unraveling of knots." But such was his own and Darwin's life work. So the latter essayed at least the explanation of heredity, and tried to unravel the knot in his ingenious theory of pangenesis. He clung to his views with typical tenacity against the doubts, denials and even rejection of them by friends. It may be also that we have not heard the last of it.

But no matter what the final and true explanation be, the marvelous condensation and locking up of the minutest details shown by two individual organisms, in those small cells that we call the egg and sperm, their fusion and the subsequent unfolding therefrom of a new individual, that blends in reduced and often balanced degree the parental details, is evidence at once of molecular organization and exactness that the mind can scarcely grasp. Darwin groped after the explanation, it is reserved for others to furnish it conclusively.

His life work thus consisted in demonstrating the order, the continuity, and the increasing diversity of all organisms, as these evolved with the increasing age of the world, and as these showed increasingly complex responses and modifications to their surroundings. Therefore reviewing all those laws and discoveries that he, his predecessors, and his collaborators laid bare, the history of organisms, as they file in procession before us, might be epitomized as follows: Heredity upbuilds, struggle for existence stimulates, environment carves and chisels, reproduction blends and continues, selective survival sits as the final arbiter of life or death for the individual and at length for the species.

Such sentences may seem far distant from us, and to carry a scientific or academic import only. But to every plant and animal, to you and to me, they become immediate and claimant problems of first import. It was this bringing near to our doors, to our persons, of each phase of the whole, that caused

the mental upheaval in 1871 when the "Descent of Man" appeared. Even the best of men at times kick when they discover that they live under eternal law. Their revolt was the more evident when it was seen that some of the most cherished human doctrines were alike man-made and contrary to evolutionary facts.

The Darwinian controversy then became no mere academic problem, that each might intellectually take sides on. It was not a question of Hegelian versus Cartesian philosophy. It was not merely a discussion of religious faith or belief, it did not involve terms that could be explained away. Mankind began to realize that it carried bound up in it the very warp and woof of human life, of your life and mine.

Possibly it may be conceded that as Darwin enunciated it, and as Huxley fought for it, the view seemed only and constantly to be pressed home of "nature red in tooth and claw." Darwin concluded his study of man at the stage where this seemed truest. One longs to know, and may try to picture, what might have resulted had he changed from a negative to a positive attitude when he wrote "I have never systematically thought much on religion in relation to science, or on morals in relation to society; and without steadily keeping my mind on such subjects for a *long* period, I am really incapable of writing anything worth sending."

We turn now from Darwin to the second group of collaborators, Spencer, Wallace and Haeckel. All three tried to grapple with the moral, and one might truly say for each of them, with the religious side of man. For they viewed him as the cope stone of organic evolution. Let me remind you here of the discriminating, learned and eminently fair criticisms of the first and third of these, that you have already had from my friend, Dr. Schiedt.

Spencer, like his writings, presents a calm calculating critical but cautious front. Wallace and especially Haeckel, the two evolutionary giants still left to us in honored age, have sounded the depths and shoals of human questions, the former

in a reverent, sympathetic, somewhat restricted spirit, the latter as a fearless, brilliant militant leader along any avenue of thought or action that research seems to open, or that speculation and imagination even suggest.

Spencer's "Social Statics" took precedence of "The Origin of Species" by nine years, his "Principles of Psychology" by four. In both, man is the pivotal organism round which facts are arrayed. In both he studies man not merely as a complex highly organized individual, he constantly emphasizes the thought that each has a relation and duty to his fellow man. And here moral relationship with mental superiority are both dwelt on and expanded. Nay more, to give perfect continuity and finish to his system, he traces the gradual evolution of life, as well as of mental processes, from the minutest cell up to man, and links with this the conception of an all-pervading power, energy or action that later may have formed the basis for Haeckel's pantheistic utterances.

To the writer an impressive feature of Spencer's "Psychology" and still more of his "Sociology" is his intense yearning after brotherhood, coöperation and peace, as correlated with and flowing from an intelligent individualism. But the sympathetic side of this desire never permitted him to lose sight of the fact that such results as had already been acquired were achieved by slow determined evolutionary means, during which man had waded through blood and suffering to achieve his high ends, as witness his letter to Wallace on publication of "Progress and Poverty." This notwithstanding, Spencer's ideal reduced to an aphorism is "Society an Organism."

The last forty years of his life saw the sure because gradual rise of coöperative societies, of trades unions, of business organizations, that all mark a mental and in most cases a moral advance on the competitive and often brutal individualism of the earlier years of the century. But he failed to see a direct guiding principle that animated and propelled the movement, while his outlook was often local and patriotic, rather than

world-wide and comprehensive. So in "Facts and Comments," the closing book of his life, such chapters as "Rebarbarization," "Regimentation" and "Barbaric Art" show that while a few years before he believed that he had built up a comprehensive evolutionary system, he failed to realize that human imperfections existed in it, which other and later workers had yet to correct. So his mental attitude is retrospective, gloomy and despairing, while he failed to concede that an international temple of peace was being planned, that international socialism was marching forward rapidly, that artistic products of highest value were being manufactured wholesale by coöperative groups of workmen on every side of him and that the forward march of education was the most remarkable feature of the decade in the middle of which "Facts and Comments" appeared.

We must all grant that Spencer has bequeathed us a large legacy. With no pretensions to the observational or experimental breadth of Darwin; lacking in large measure therefore the freshness and originality that come from direct contact with nature; largely ignorant of the continuous details of botanical and zoölogical papers as clearly evidenced from his scant reference to current or preceding literature, and as candidly confessed by his secretary, Collier, he nevertheless showed a wide analytic and synthetic grasp, that in its very expansiveness carried him far beyond the regions that the greater seer so fully and successfully explored. Some of his most fundamental and cherished principles, the writer believes, will ultimately be set aside or reduced to minor place, but equally the man and his work will live as strong links in the great chain of evolutionary history.

Royce's sympathetic estimate is worth quoting: "His beautiful straightforwardness of personal character, his noble independence of spirit, his loyalty to what he conceived to be his task, his humanity, his advocacy of rational, social and international peace and liberty,—these things compensate for much imperfection in the result of his philosophy. His demand

that the evolutionary concepts shall be unified, remains a permanently inspiring logical idea which will bear much fruit in future. His service as a teacher of his age will never be forgotten."

Wallace's earlier studies were practically confined to zoology, and much of that work had been more exhaustively paralleled by Darwin, if we except his splendid investigations into the geographical distribution of animals, on warning colors in insects and other valuable biological inquiries. But the appearance of Darwin's "*Descent of Man*" caused Wallace to indicate his dissent to the conclusions on man's mental and moral sides. Both naturalists had seen much of some of earth's lowest human tribes. Darwin, like Spencer and Haeckel, regarded the evolutionary continuity as unbroken and uniform. Wallace considered "that there is a difference in kind, intellectually and morally, between man and other animals; and that while his body was undoubtedly developed by the continuous modification of some ancestral animal form, some different agency, analogous to that which first produced organic life, and then originated *consciousness*, came into play in order to develop the higher intellectual and spiritual nature of man." We would regard the hitherto adduced evidence as largely in favor of the first three naturalists.

But Wallace has been a lofty and consistent advocate of man's freedom, his rights, and the necessity for his continued mental and moral elevation. This, again, led him unreservedly to accept socialism on perusal of Bellamy's and related works. As already stated, he further accepted spiritualism as a definite phenomenon to be accounted for in man's higher being. The closing years of his life therefore see him aspiring, even more earnestly than Spencer, toward "society as an organism." Why, it may here be asked, did both naturalists, and to a modified degree, Haeckel, advocate such views? In answer it might be replied, and perhaps correctly, that coöperative or socialistic effort has proved most beneficial in the evolution of many of the highest groups of animals. The bees,

ants and some wasps, among insects, groups of well-known and cosmopolitan birds, as well as many of the most widely dispersed and abundant mammals show distinct social tendencies. The resulting benefits for themselves and their young offspring are many and have unitedly enabled them to become, in number of individuals, in wide distribution and in specialized efficiency "dominant races." But we believe that a far more important and a far-reaching law is involved, the discussion of which has not yet been attempted. The attitude of both naturalists, however, is a legacy worth treasuring, view it as we may.

Haeckel, the outstanding champion of unification of the world processes, is still happily left to us. No one can read his "Monism" (1895), his "Riddle of the Universe" (1900) or his "Wonders of Life" (1904) without feeling that here are focused up messages to man from one who had, by his minute study, wide reading, deep thinking and love for his fellows, qualified himself as few ever did for the task. If Darwin was denounced by many in high places for trying to unfold the truth, Haeckel has been thrice denounced. This has been largely due to his impetuous scorn of all that would shackle man's intellect, that would destroy his freedom of body, that would waste his time, or that would impose on his credulity through a want of knowledge to combat error.

For him also man is the organism of supreme importance, though he is but the highest expression of one great indestructible *world-substance* that is permeated by *world-energy*. From this one ever-working, ever-changing combination, monistic action flows. This expresses itself in physical, organic, mental and moral action under appropriate surroundings and combinations. Reason and religion are its highest manifestations. "But it is only in the most highly developed vertebrates—birds and mammals—that we discern the first beginnings of reason, the first traces of religious and ethical conduct." In man this attains highest perfection, while the all-embracing pantheism of his faith finds expression in the words "the

monistic idea of God, which alone is compatible with our present knowledge of nature, recognizes the divine spirit in all things. It can never recognize in God a 'Personal Being' or, in other words, an individual of limited extension in space, or even of human form. God is everywhere."

For Haeckel it must be said that even his worst and most critical opponents present a less logical front and have stood less the test of time than he. Du Bois-Reymond's famous seven world-enigmas have—in three or four of them—been in large part penetrated and satisfactorily solved. The revolutionizing relations of radium as already studied, give a possible monistic explanation to chemico-physical action, while his forerunners, Spinoza and Goethe, probably never had a more numerous following than now. But to Haeckel, as to all philosophers, the origin of the great first cause, the origin of substance and of energy, are as insoluble now as when man first began to reason on his relation to the universe.

Haeckel fails also largely in recognizing the noble character, powerful originality and pure teachings of Christ as well as some of his disciples, and so has misinterpreted and completely under-estimated the fundamental importance of the Christ movement. This has largely been due, as we believe, to his having failed to separate the dross of subsequent base concretions from the gold that has helped the world on to this day. Haeckel repeatedly acknowledges with gratitude "the lofty principle of universal charity and the fundamental maxim of ethics, the 'golden rule' that issues therefrom." But he as often tries to evade its importance by saying "both, however, existed in theory and in practice centuries before the time of Christ." But will we today belittle Darwin's labors because Buffon, Lamarck, Wells, Matthew and Spencer all more or less antedated him?

The very fact that the altruistic doctrines of Christ and of Paul overran the old world against fearful odds and prevailed, at one time in Waldensian valleys, at another in Moravian homes; here on English plains against the persecu-

tion of a Charles, there across Scottish moorlands amid the murderous assaults of a Claverhouse; at length in the Netherlands and from there to American shores, finding that triumph that has come as a precious legacy to us, is proof of the potent and pervasive character of the heaven. Equally true is it that during Frederick the Great's "insane period of history," from the fifth to the sixteenth century, the highest representatives of spurious Christianity, from Pope down to priest, cursed the Christian world, but that the primitive doctrine still flowed pure in many streams to energize humanity, and that the highest development of the race has been reached as a post-Reformation effect. These are partial evidences in favor of the positions so ably advocated by Drummond, Kidd and Chamberlain.

Disguise it as we may or as we wish to, the great central Gospel law, the "Golden Rule," is the perfected, monistic morality and religion of two millennia ago, that has helped and inspired mankind up to the present day. This law interpreted in Haeckel's phraseology would be "Love the great World-power that energizes and lives in matter, and that governs all processes; love also the units detached from it, and that will be received back into it, as you would love yourself, since all are equally derived." Such is the fundamental concept that Christ as well as Paul and other of the early seers taught, as being alone able to develop "Society as an organism." Such the branches of the Christian Church teach when they please, but they too often fail in large measure to commend it or to mould it to daily life.

Haeckel's legacy to us will, we believe, be an increasing one for the future, as representing final freedom for the intellect, highest aspiration after noble ideals and a reverential outlook on all world forces. But whatever is best in that legacy will be retained, by quiet and patient cross questioning of natural phenomena, rather than by dogmatic insistence that "all is finished," "all is proved." Final results have not yet been reached, wide fields of study have yet to be explored.

The third group of workers, personified amongst others by Drummond, Kidd and Chamberlain, may well be called the post-Darwinian idealists, since their labors began when the most active period for the others closed. Their studies also have largely been concerned with the higher evolution of the mental, moral and the religious sides of man. The writer believes he is neither unjust nor inaccurate in saying that most scientists have regarded them as unworthy of consideration, because the scientists have not had the true measuring rod by which to estimate them, while the high priests of religion have placed them in the outer court of the Gentiles, for reasons that are manifest. But their day is in the future, and when the impartial survey of nineteenth century thought is made, their contributions will occupy no mean niche in the temple of evolutionary truth. The writer considers that they largely stand alone, because in the interpretation of natural and religious processes the true continuity-relation has been overlooked. But it would be impossible here and now to demonstrate the correctness of this statement.

If we attempt, then, in a few words, to estimate the methods by which the evolutionary legacy of to-day has been secured, it might be said that Darwin and Wallace thought wisely, Spencer thought widely, Haeckel thought daringly, the last group reverently. All have united in a successful effort to free the mind of man from misconceptions, to guide him into true lines of reasoning, to use the knowledge of all ages that has proved of permanent value, to perfect new methods of investigation and experiment, to scatter widespread the acquired knowledge, as being for all future times and peoples.

It is recognized that the one organism Man possesses, dominates, and will still more fully dominate the earth, so that man's evolution is now the great and central problem of the system that Darwin, Spencer, Wallace and Haeckel have established. His world-wide advance and occupancy may seem to be checked at one time by selective survival of the Russian thistle, at another by the insidious relation and action of the

mosquito, in one place by the temporary fertility of the rabbit, in another by "plague" of divers sorts. But the nineteenth century, *the evolutionary century*, has included the year of his "coming of age." Man now no longer sees with the eyes of the individual; he penetrates the past, the present, the future with the compound eyes of "society as an organism." Nationality counts now for little and will count for less in the future. World problems are before us, for man's exploitation of the world is becoming increasingly easy.

Whether, therefore, it be an international study of infection by mosquito or by tuberculosis germ; of selective breeding along exact lines, for production of the best races of plants or animals; of the acclimatization and adaptation of useful forms; of the reclamation and the enrichment of the earth; of the best devices for man's mental and ethical improvement; the bonds of municipality, of state, of nationality can no longer fetter or limit.

Such questions do not concern only sociologists, economists or moralists. They are biological questions. *And every human being is a biologist.* For though each may not be trained in this or that *laboratory* so called, each daily experiences and is affected by environmental agents, to which response is made. Each records also, if in the least degree thinking and reflecting, the cyclic changes noted in plants and animals around. Results therefore accumulate that each describes to the home circle, to friends, to the world, as impressively and effectively mayhap, as does a teacher in some great university. This it is which explains in large measure the remarkable success which the works of Darwin, Spencer, Wallace, Huxley, Haeckel, Drummond and Kidd have achieved. This is the thinking, reflecting, acting age of mankind, and so when it was groping after such works, because it needed them, they were found and welcomed. The truths these works contain will gradually be gathered and conserved, as jewels of the nineteenth century. The slips, the mistakes, the rash statements, the false generalizations will be eliminated, but meanwhile

mankind will march forward, as new seers arise to guide by added truths.

May we not regard it then as the crowning legacy of nineteenth century advance, that knowledge is now for all, that schools, colleges and universities no longer exist to manufacture a select and privileged cult, but to people the world with the highest types of earnest thinking individuals, that as to-day is the best day in the world's history, so future days will be on ever higher planes?

No more beautiful, pathetic, longing reflection was ever penned than Herbert Spencer's last chapter on "Facts and Comments," that he called "Ultimate Questions." It has in it the color of the autumn leaf, the twittering wail of the English robin which feels that winter is coming, the first snow-fall of the Swiss mountain tops that brings early death to the alpine flowers and butterflies. Spencer thought of each life—of his own life—in its apparent insignificance, as compared with *space*, illimitable *space*, with all its mysteries, and he felt overpowered by his own littleness.

Though we may linger affectionately on the reflection, we would not forget that every individual fills a place in that space, and by all evolutionary laws must fill it to the fullest and best degree. That is the call made on each of us. Each one fills it best who most highly and most perfectly responds.

IV.

A NEW BOUNDARY STONE OF NEBUCHAD- REZZAR I. FROM NIPPUR.

A REPLY.

PROF. WM. J. HINKE, PH.D., D.D.

Under the above title the University of Pennsylvania published in December, 1907, a book, prepared by the writer, and in part submitted by him as his thesis for the Ph.D. degree. It was reviewed in the January number of the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW of the current year (Vol. XIII., pp. 114-121) by Professor I. H. DeLong. I regard his adverse criticism, with which he greeted the book, as so eminently unfair and entirely unjustified, that I feel constrained to write a reply. I do it all the more unwillingly because it is the first time that I have engaged in anything like a controversy. I would have passed by his unexpected attack upon my scholarship and reputation, if I did not feel that my friends in the Reformed Church expected me to defend myself.

In answering my reviewer I cannot possibly follow his curiously arranged criticisms, which pass without order and plan from one point to another. He begins with a discussion of some symbols of the Nippur stone, pictured on page 120 of my book. Then he passes to some grammatical questions mentioned on pp. 180 and 176. This leads him to the "Corrections and Additions," pp. 320-323. From the end he turns to the introduction, pp. 1-115. Then he visits with his disapproval a judgment of Dr. Clay. Next he finds fault with my supposed Pan-Babylonianism (p. 75). This leads him, by some mysterious association of ideas, to the curses, mentioned on the boundary stones, especially to what is said on page 185. From that he passes quite easily to a discussion

of the Assyrian verb *alāku*. Then he takes up the "misleading" title of the book. Next follows a criticism of the centaur on page 99. But before he is through with that, he thinks he can discover a flaw in my statement with regard to the Assyrian word *ilku*, page 177. After this diversion he opens his heaviest fire on the round zodiac of Dendera, from which he emerges with the consciousness of having thoroughly established his point, that my book is altogether unreliable and richly deserving of a solemn warning to all readers to beware.

My critic will pardon me if I prefer a more methodical arrangement, and take up his points, which he selects for criticism, in the order in which they appear in my book.

What I regard as one of the most undeserved criticisms is that referring to the title of my book. What I object to particularly is the insinuation (wholly unworthy of a theological professor) that the title was chosen only to advertise myself (*der Reklame wegen gewählt*). Why should he use the German phrase? Was he ashamed to put it into plain English? Or, may I ask, was there anything in my book or in my previous record, which justified such a slur? Was it not rather an exhibition of those well-known, literary manners, in vogue in continental Europe, which my critic seems to delight in? But how does he justify such a criticism? He tells his readers that my title is "misleading." This is a singularly ill-chosen word. Webster defines it as leading one astray "through false information or erroneous judgment." Now what part of the title gave false information? Is it not true that my book contains a full description of the Nippur stone, together with a translation and interpretation of its inscription? To quote an illustration: Professor W. Wright, in his "Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages," p. 18, justly calls the title, under which one of the later Syriac versions of the gospels was first published, namely, "*Evangeliarium Hierosolymitanum*," misleading, because there is nothing to connect this lectionary (now in the Vatican

library) with Jerusalem. But my critic can neither challenge the fact that the inscription, which I published, was that of a boundary stone, nor that it came from Nippur. The title was, therefore, not misleading. It might be called "not comprehensive enough," or something similar, but it did not deserve the description of my critic. The reason for the form of the title of my book, which my critic says is beyond his understanding, appears perfectly plain and reasonable to other, more fair-minded men. Thus for example Dr. Ward, the well-known editor of the *Independent*, writes in the "Old Penn Weekly": "The *modest* title of this book by a young scholar comes from the fact that the boundary stone alone was the subject of a doctor's thesis." In view of the many scholars, who had preceded me in the treatment of Babylonian boundary stones (see my bibliography), I was well aware that I could not offer startling discoveries, but could give only a systematic discussion of the various problems, raised in connection with this subject, I therefore chose the more modest title to indicate that I regarded the translation of the new text from Nippur as my main contribution to these studies. And why should I not be permitted to enjoy this liberty, without being subjected to such harsh and unjust criticism? Does not my attitude in this matter stand somewhat in contrast to that of my critic, who seems to use his review of my book to advertise the fact that he regarded himself, by his travels, as amply qualified to pass an authoritative judgment on my book? On page 114 of his review he informs his readers that he has been "among the modern Bedouin and felaheen of Palestine some time"; page 115, that he "made inquiries among the natives during his connection, as Thayer Fellow, with the American School for Oriental Study and Research in Palestine"; page 117, that he "made a list of all Arabic curses that we heard in the land"; page 118, "while in Egypt, as a member of the American School, the Hathor temple of Denderah was one of the special places of study and observation." Of course his readers could not be expected to be

acquainted with all these interesting facts, and therefore (although they did not throw any light on Babylonian boundary stones) it was desirable to give them this important and valuable information. But, we might well ask, why was all this information put into the review of a book? Reviews are usually not written for such purposes. The main purpose of a review, as I conceive it, is to give a fair and adequate statement of what a book contains, together with an estimate of the main position of the author. In both of these points my critic has failed utterly as a reviewer. He has neither given the readers of the REFORMED CHURCH REVIEW a fair statement of what my book contained, nor has he offered an adequate criticism of my *main* contentions. He has rather lost himself in minutiae, in all of which he might be entirely correct and yet he would not have touched the real merits of my book. As one of my friends, a well-known Assyriologist, puts it in a letter, which is before me while I am writing: "I am astonished that one who is no Assyriologist should pick out a few infinitely small misprints and other secondary and tertiary matter, and represent them as of utmost value and review your book on the basis of these, as he does."

Let us now take up some of these points, to which my critic attaches so much importance.

On page 116 he charges me with having joined or being on the way of joining the Pan-Babylonists. This he does because I express the opinion, on the basis of the investigations of Winckler and Jeremias, that according to the belief of the Babylonians earthly conditions find their prototypes in heaven and that, therefore, Babylonian temples were supposed to be modelled after heavenly patterns. Now if Professor D. does not accept this statement let him prove that it is erroneous and not obscure the issue by raising entirely different questions. By giving my adherence to this one, definite point, I am far from endorsing every position, taken by Winckler and his school, still less am I compelled to extend, like Winckler, the Babylonian "Weltanschauung" to the inter-

pretation of the Old Testament. Those are entirely different questions. My statement dealt with the beliefs of the Babylonians and not with the interpretation of the Old Testament. In defence of my position I may state that (1) among the symbols of the boundary stones stage-towers are found (see Fig. 22, p. 74, of my book), (2) these towers are called *eshrêti*, "sanctuaries, temples," in the inscriptions (see p. 73 f.), (3) that these temples are heavenly appears from the astral character of all the other symbols (p. 115), and (4) that the heavenly temples are the patterns for those on earth, follows from the Babylonian doctrine, which may be expressed with Jeremias: "Das Himmelsbild ist gleich dem Weltenbild";¹ or with Ungnad: "Der Mikrokosmos ist nur ein Abbild des Makrokosmos."² If Dr. D. is able to prove this thesis wrong he is welcome to do it. But neither ridicule nor generalities will accomplish it.

From pp. 118-120 my critic labors long and hard to prove that I fell into a number of errors with regard to the round zodiac of Dendera. In the first place he claims that my description of the archer on that zodiac must certainly be wrong, because my picture (fig. 33) does not agree with my description. The tail of the centaur cannot be a horsetail. It is too long, it does not have the right shape and the hoofs of the animal are cloven. All these acute observations, however, are misspent, because, as I shall presently show, my reference on page 99 was not at all to fig. 33, but to the centaur on fig. 34, to which none of the objections of my critic apply. As far as fig. 33 is concerned I have good reasons, I believe, for thinking that the tail of the centaur was meant for a horsetail, in spite of the objections of my critic.

Besides questioning my statement with regard to the centaur, my critic also challenges my drawing of the centaur of fig. 33, because I state in my "List of Illustrations," that it was taken from Boll's "Sphæra," pl. II. This cannot be cor-

¹ Cf. "Das alte Testament im Lichte des alten Orients," 1st ed., p. 8.

² Ungnad, "Die Deutung der Zukunft bei den Babyloniern und Assyriern," p. 8. This view is also endorsed by Professor Jastrow; cf. his "Religion Assyriens und Babyloniens," Vol. II., p. 433, note.

rect (he says), because it differs from that figure in several particulars. The question, however, which is of greater interest to me is, whether my picture is a faithful representation of the original. The materials which I used were a photograph of a cast, now in the Louvre,³ the picture of a drawing as found in the "*Description de l'Egypte*"⁴ and a drawing in the "*Memoires de l'Institut Royal de France*," Vol. XVI. My picture is a combination of all these sources, the most important, the photograph of the cast being indistinct in some places. What source I should mention in my list was a matter of judgment. I might have quoted pl. III. of Boll, or pls. II. and III., as I probably would have done if my attention had been called to it in time. If the professor had examined pl. III. of Boll as carefully as I tried to have it reproduced, he would have found the second tail of centaur exactly as I give it. A beginner in German knows, that when Boll says: "*Es ist nicht deutlich*" (it is not distinct), he does not mean to say that it is invisible. Indeed to my mind the word "indistinct" is too strong. I should say "somewhat indistinct," as my eyes are able to see all but a tiny portion.

But my critic claims that there are other errors in connection with my statements about the round zodiac of Dendera. I am supposed to be hopelessly confused both as to its designation and its date. As Boll shows, on the basis of earlier investigations, the rectangular zodiac dates from the time of the emperor Nero (p. 159) and the round zodiac belongs, according to Letronne, to the time of Augustus (p. 160). This is exactly as I give the dates below my pictures of these zodiacs (figs. 34 and 35). But on page 99 I refer to a "square" zodiac of Dendera, dating from the time of Nero, and showing a double-headed centaur, drawing a bow, winged and having two tails, the lower of a horse and the upper of a scorpion. Now what zodiac did I mean? The round zodiac does not date from the time of Nero, nor does my description agree with the picture on the round zodiac. From this it follows that by

³ Boll, "*Sphæra*," pl. III.

⁴ Boll, "*Sphæra*," pl. II.

the term "square" I actually meant the rectangular zodiac, because that alone fits my description. If therefore my critic was so anxious to correct me he should have made the right correction and should have said: "The word 'square' is a slip for rectangular," for that is what it really was. This simple solution of the difficulty, which Dr. D. should have recognized at once, shows that I was not confused as to designation or date. There is no confusion at all, but an unfortunate failure to express correctly what was really in my mind. There is a mistake in the single word "square," but it does not involve me in the mental confusion on which my critic wastes so many words.

On page 114 of his review Dr. D. refers to the symbols, nos. 3, 6, and 9 of the Nippur stone, which he informs his readers are comparatively common on the monuments. In this he is entirely mistaken. The truth of the matter is that these symbols as they appear on the Nippur stone (see fig. 47) are absolutely unique, for they have animal heads in their center such as are found nowhere else. Even without these heads, maces with globular tops (as I called them) are far from common, for, as my critic could have learnt from page 242 of my book, they are found only five times on the thirty-seven stones described by me. The assertion that these symbols and even the spearhead (fig. 47, no. 1) are at times regarded as phallic emblems is news to me. I have never seen such a truly remarkable claim. At least no Assyriologist was ever guilty of it. How could a spear or a club with a big ball at one end represent a phallic emblem? But what is true is that a whole boundary stone is regarded by some⁵ as representing a phallus. Of this, however, there is no evidence aside from its peculiar shape. The comparison of these Babylonian symbols with present-day Arabic weapons, as proposed by Dr. D., is not likely to produce any tangible results.

The discovery of the Aramaic word הלכא on the Babylonian contract tablets and its equation with the Babylonian word

⁵ See e. g., *Jeremias*, "Das alte Testament," etc., 1st ed., p. 262, note 1.

ilku will remain to the credit of Professor Clay, in spite of Dr. D.'s objections. He has utterly misunderstood Professor Clay, if he imagined him to admit that Prof. Montgomery made that discovery. My critic should have noticed that the word *הלכא* occurs at two other places in the Aramaic dockets published by Professor Clay. It appears plainly on no. 48, l. 2,⁶ and also on no. 35, l. 3.⁷ All that Prof. Montgomery did was to suggest (as Professor Clay plainly states) that in no. 26, l. 1⁸ the letter *ṣ* was written on *ṣ*. This Dr. Clay recognized at once gave him a third instance of the word *הלכא*. The reason why I did not quote the plainest case (no. 48) was because it was unpublished, and the second (no. 35) was incomplete.

The suggestion of my critic (p. 117) that the Babylonian word *alāku*, occurring in the new Nippur text (Col. II., 2) should be connected with the Arabic *halaka* is worthless, for (1) the Hebrew dictionaries of Gesenius and Briggs-Brown show that this Arabic word belongs to the Hebrew word *הלך*, "to go," which passed through a similar development of meaning as the Latin *ire* and *perire*, or the German *gehen* and *vergehen*; (2) The Assyrian syllabary, quoted by me, shows that there was an Assyrian word *alāku*, used as a synonym of *nadû*, "to throw down" and *maqātu*, "to fall" and "to fall upon." (3) The other passage quoted by me (p. 179) shows that it was used of herbs thrown into the flame of the altar. Aromatic herbs do not "perish" on the altar, nor are they "destroyed" on it. This leads me to think that one who cannot claim to be an Assyriologist should refrain from further attempts to elucidate Assyrian lexicography.

If it had been my object to quote besides the curses of the boundary stones curses as found in other literature, especially in the Bible, I could have easily done so. The Old Testament furnishes much closer parallels than the one in the book of Revelation, to which Dr. D. calls attention. With the Baby-

* Cf. p. 316 of "Old Testament and Semitic Studies in Memory of William Rainey Harper."

⁶ P. 312, l. c.

⁷ P. 308, l. c.

lonian curse: "May another own the house he built" (p. 69) compare Deut. 28:30: "Thou shalt build an house and thou shalt not dwell therein," or with the curse of Gula: "May she put destructive sickness into his body, so that dark and bright red blood issue forth as water" (p. 59); compare II. Sam. 3:29: "Let there not fail from the house of Joab one that hath an issue of blood, or that is a leper, etc."

My critic finds one of the most serious faults of my book in the long list of "additions and corrections." But he failed to state that more than a page of the additions is taken up with a description of the zodiac of Gezer, which was not published till after the first part of my book was in print. The same is true of my reference to the new book of Kugler (p. 321 last note). Eight of the notes, covering in all 54 lines (more than a page) were communicated by Professor Hilprecht, and reached me only after the page proof was in my hands, and therefore could not be inserted in their proper places without much cost. Thus there remain only about a page of corrections, which instead of being a sign of carelessness should rather be regarded as an endeavor on my part to send out the book as perfect as I was able to make it. That all my other critics regarded them in that light is evident from the fact that none of them referred to these corrections. In looking at other books I find myself in very good company. The new Hebrew dictionary of Briggs and Brown has eight and a half pages of Addenda. Wellhausen in his famous book "*Reste des Arabischen Heidentums*" adds eight pages of "*Nachträge and Berichtigungen*." But why multiply examples? After my critic has published some books himself he will doubtless be glad to avail himself of the opportunity of adding such a list.

I have now reviewed the professor's criticisms. I fail to find that he has succeeded in showing the least inaccuracy in any of my pictures. Nor has he given any adequate justification for his solemn warning against my book at the end of his review. Aside from a few self-evident misprints and the wrong use of a single word (which he failed to explain cor-

rectly), I am unable to accept any of his corrections. His judgment on page 115 of his review that my first chapter (pp. 1-115) is "in the main nothing more than a partial summing up and registering of previous results of scholars working in this particular field of Assyriology" can only be regarded as that of an incompetent judge, because he is neither an Assyriologist, nor a specialist on Babylonian boundary stones.

If Dr. D. had been a specialist, I am sure he would not have made such a statement, for he would have known it to be inaccurate. That this is the case can readily be shown. My first chapter (pp. 1-115) to which Dr. D. applies this judgment consists, as my list of contents shows (pp. viii-ix), of nine sections. The first eight sections (pp. 1-71) had not been treated connectedly by any one, as far as my knowledge goes. If Dr. D. knows of any books or even articles in periodicals, where any of the subjects are treated, let him name them. The contents of the last section, the symbols of the boundary stones, have often been discussed. I give the earlier literature fairly complete on pp. 71-73.

The symbols of the boundary stones are, in the first place, symbolic representations of the various Babylonian deities (p. 87). Of the more than forty symbols twenty can now be identified with their respective deities (p. 96, note 2). What I contributed to this list may be seen from the review of Dr. Ward in the *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*. He says: "Hinke deserves credit for the ingenuity with which he recognizes the various emblems of *Nebo*. . . . The mace or rather ashera with the lion's head Hinke finds to be the emblem of *Nergal*, as he reads the sign GIR for Nergal on De Morgan's Kudurru I. This is important because it makes the ashera with the two lions' heads *Ninib*. . . . Hinke is also to be credited with making it very probable that the reading in De Morgan's Kudurru I., of the inscription attached to the walking bird is *Bau*. This is important because it differentiates *Bau* from *Gula*." Independently of Dr. Ward I also recognized that the shrine with the yoke or better headdress is probably

a representation of *Nincharsag* (p. 95). Thus while I based my investigation on earlier work, I added something of my own, as Dr. Ward frankly acknowledges (p. 409 of his review). How my critic can justify the qualifying adjective, a "partial" summing up, I cannot understand. I believe it to be entirely unwarranted by the facts in the case. If not, let Dr. D. supply the parts that were wanting to make the summing up complete. From all this it follows, that after eliminating the word "partial," the judgment of Dr. D. could only refer to the last section (pp. 71-115) of my introduction. But even with this limitation it is not entirely correct. On pp. 92-95 I do not only register the opinion of Professor Zimmern, but seek to combat it with arguments. A new boundary stone, published since the appearance of my book by Professor Scheil,⁹ has justified my contention.

But the symbols are more than symbolic representations of the gods. I contended that they were also by implication figures of certain constellations (p. 96). By the leading authorities (Hommel, Winckler, etc.) they are regarded as representations of the zodiacal signs. I do not simply copy this opinion but try to show that it should be modified (pp. 98-106). Finally I compare with these symbols the pictures of the "Dodecaoros," as found in Greece, Egypt, Tibet and India. Here again I do not simply register the opinion of one of the leading astronomers, Redlich, but suggest a modification of his views (pp. 106-115). Instead of being, therefore, a simple registering of previous results, an unbiased criticism will acknowledge that I have tried to make this section an independent examination of the whole question, confirming partly earlier views, modifying in part others and adding finally some new suggestions of my own.

There is, however, another method of showing that Dr. D.'s judgment of my book as a whole cannot be accepted as conclusive. That is by quoting the opinions of specialists, whose brilliant investigations in the various departments of Assyriology entitle them to speak with authority, and whose hearty

⁹ "Délégation en Perse," Vol. X.

endorsement of my book proves conclusively that it is not as faulty and worthless as my reviewer has tried to make it appear.

Professor Hilprecht: "Your book, which I watched from beginning to end required an enormous amount of personal labor and devotion, an extensive knowledge of cuneiform and other literature, and a great familiarity with Babylonian grammar, lexicography and palaeography. Assyriologists may differ from you on some minor points, but every fair-minded specialist will agree with me that your book is an excellent piece of work, which for years to come will serve as *the* handbook *par excellence* for the study of the *kudurru* inscriptions and the much discussed pictures often occurring in connection with them. It goes without saying that your volume, compared with similar previous publications, denotes a very decided advance in our correct understanding of this important and instructing class of documents. It seemed to me, therefore, very natural that your book should find that universal enthusiastic reception, which characterized its appearance both in Europe and America. I can speak very positively on this point, as quite a number of our leading authorities on their own account have written to me in very appreciative terms about your book."

Professor Jastrow: "It is a splendid contribution to the subject and one that redounds to your credit as well as the institution in which you received part of your training."

Professor Clay: "The work which takes such high rank as a scientific contribution is a most excellent production of American scholarship, in which the author may justly take pride, for the volume will serve as the basis for future studies in this interesting class of inscriptions."¹⁰

Professor Barton, of Bryn Mawr: "My cordial congratulations on the accomplishment of so fine a piece of work."

Dr. Ward, long a recognized authority on Babylonian divine symbols: "It is a very full and careful discussion of the character and purpose of these objects, a collection, with figures, of those thus far known, and the identification as far as pos-

¹⁰ *Records of the Past*, January-February, 1908.

sible, of the objects represented on them. . . . Hinke has carefully gathered the fruit of German and French scholars on this fascinating subject and has added something of his own."¹¹

Professor Grimm, of Gettysburg, formerly fellow in Semitic languages in Johns Hopkins University: "Professor Hinke has done a valuable service for the elucidation of these interesting monuments by his clear, thorough, scholarly treatise."¹²

Professor Sayce, of Oxford: "The book is an admirable example not only of printing, but still more of Assyriological research. It is, in fact, a model of what a work of the kind ought to be, and approaches perfection as nearly as is possible for human endeavor. It is full of new light, as well as of photographs and other illustrations of the symbols found on the Babylonian boundary stones."¹³

Professor Johns, of Cambridge: "In glancing through it I see enough to congratulate you on a most excellent piece of work, which fills a long-felt gap."

Dr. Daiches: "A concordance of proper names, a list of symbols and a glossary enhance the value of this industrious, well arranged and well printed book. To every future student of this branch of Assyriology Dr. Hinke's treatise will be indispensable."¹⁴

Luzac's Oriental List: "What we have said will serve to indicate that the volume forms a valuable contribution to the study of a subject which is now engaging very general attention. . . . Dr. Hinke is to be congratulated on the manner in which he has made an important Babylonian text available for study." (March-April, 1908.)

Professor Hommel, of Munich: "It is a fine book and will make a good impression. One can see that you have had an excellent teacher and have also yourself done excellent work." (Es ist ein feines Buch und wird einen guten Eindruck machen. Man sieht Sie haben einen ausgezeichneten Lehrer

¹¹ *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Vol. XXI., p. 408 f.

¹² *Lutheran Quarterly*, October, 1908.

¹³ *Expository Times*, August, 1908.

¹⁴ *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*, 1908, p. 876.

gehabt und haben aber auch selbst ausgezeichnetes geleistet.)

Professor Meissner, of Breslau: "The make-up of the book is indeed wonderful. Now we have all the so-called boundary stones lucidly placed together, so that every one interested in them can without difficulty study these questions. The philological treatment of the inscriptions pleases me very much; there is hardly anything to be found fault with." (Die Ausstattung des Werkes ist ja wundervoll. Nun haben wir alle sog. Grenzsteine übersichtlich neben einander gestellt, und jeder Interessent kann ohne Mühe diese Fragen studieren. Die philologische Behandlung der Inschriften gefällt mir sehr gut, es ist wohl kaum etwas daran auszusetzen.)

Professor Bezold, of Heidelberg: "That is indeed a splendid compendium of *kudurrus*." (Das ist in der That ein herrliches *Kudurru* Compendium.)

Professor Lehmann-Haupt, of Berlin: "The volume of Hinke is very valuable." (Hinke's Band ist sehr wertvoll.)

Dr. Ungnad, of Berlin: "For books which prepare the way for later labors as well as yours, science must be especially grateful to the author. There is indeed an enormous amount of labor involved in the complete literary references which you give." (Für Bücher, die späteren Arbeiten so gut den Weg bahnen wie ihres, muss die Wissenschaft dem Autor besonders dankbar sein. Es steckt ja eine enorme Arbeit namentlich in den vollständigen Literaturnachweisen, die Sie geben.)

Dr. Zehnpfund: "We are indebted to Hilprecht himself in no small degree, that from his school such a thorough and scientifically sound work could come." (Wir danken es nicht zum wenigsten Hilprecht selbst dass aus seiner Schule eine solche gründliche, und wissenschaftlich gediegene Arbeit hervorgehen konnte.)¹⁵

These and other opinions of prominent specialists have come to the writer either through scientific journals or private letters. Where no other source is given the opinions are taken from private letters, which have been written unsolicited to the author.

¹⁵ Theol. Literaturblatt, September 11, 1908.

V.

THE ETHICS OF SUFFERING.

BY REV. JOHN BENJAMIN RUST, PH.D.

O Qual, O Qual!

Die Angst jagt mich auf! Warum schlug mir nicht
Sein Arm durch die Brust mit zweischneid'gem Schwert?

Elender ich, weh, weh,

Im Elend versunken ganz ohne Trost.

Sophocles, "Antigone," 1306.

Um deine Sophistereien auf einmal einzureissen, frag' ich Dich nur das: Du glaubst das Dasein Gottes, die Unsterblichkeit der Seele, die Freiheit des Menschen. Gleichwohl dachtest Du ohne Zweifel nicht, dass der Mensch blos zum Ungefaer auf die Welt gerufen worden, blos um zu leben, zu leiden, und zu sterben. Hat es keinen moralischen Zweck und Gegenstand?—Jean Paul Richter, *Lettre xxii.*, Werke LXV., 190.

El destino del hombre en este mundo es gozar poco, padecer mucho, y siempre esperar.—Spanish Proverb.

They that sow in tears shall reap in joy. He that goeth forth and weepeth, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him.—Psalm 126.

Mortalis nemo est, quem non attingat dolor morbusque.

Cicero, "Tusc. Disp.," III., 25.

In contemplating the work of creation, the world around us, the deep earnest facts of existence, and the glimmering stars that stud the sky, faintly suggesting to us the vastness of the universe, both faith and reason, in the effort to fathom the cause of things, rest in the thought, as in no other, that an infinite will, the will of God, lies back of, and sustains the domain of nature. We can trace His guiding hand in the growth of the plant, in the change of the seasons, in the diurnal periods of labor and recuperation, and in the watering of the earth. In the silvery stream we see reflected the image of our Maker. In the storm, the torrent, the lightning's flash, and the thunderbolt, we read His boundless power. All things point to Almighty God as the First Cause, as the Au-

thor of heaven and earth. Our hearts go out to Him in thankful submission and childlike reverence, because we realize that He is good, that His works are good, and that we depend wholly upon Him for life, for light, for truth, for happiness, and for immortality. But there exists one fact which troubles us. We cannot understand the presence of evil. The problem of human pain we are unable to solve. At every turn it meets us. The older we grow, the more real and the more stubborn does it become. We move along quietly perhaps for years on the even tenor of our way, when suddenly some terrible catastrophe awakens us from the pious calm of cherished hopes, and shakes our system of faith to its very foundation. Then we say that the world is less beautiful than we had imagined, and human life a possession less to be coveted than we had taught ourselves to believe. We confess that the fears, the agonies, the broken hopes, the wrecked happiness, the ruined futures, the periodically widespread destruction of human life, mar this great theater of action, this earth, made by the Hand of God, the Holy, the Just, the Good. The answer that there exists no real evil, that all evil is only hidden good, does not satisfy us.¹ We know better. But we find it to be well nigh impossible to reconcile that knowledge with the Being and Character of God. And the common solution that *sin* is the ultimate source of all our ills as a race, fails sometimes, in the hour when pain weighs heavily upon us, to explain the mystery. If we could look into the future and read all its individual possibilities, we might think differently, and then perhaps there would not be so many tears, such countless regrets, such untold sorrows, nor the frequent rebellion against God. Then the purpose of suffering, as we shall see, would fail utterly, and leave us poorer by reason thereof. We cannot read the future, nor can we guess at its secrets with sufficient confidence to satisfy our hopes. We live in the present. Hence our judgment and our feelings

¹ "We too often forget that not only is there 'a soul of goodness in things evil,' but very generally also, a soul of truth in things erroneous." (Herbert Spencer, "First Principles," Chapter I.)

are biased, are governed largely, among most men wholly, by the experiences of the present, or by those of the past as recurring in the present. It is the veiled future, the omnipresent mystery of existence, which causes suffering often to be so keen, worse for those who witness than for those who experience it.

We may speak of the laws of nature as being inexorable. We may extend our conception of the world so as to sacrifice the individual and lose sight of the particle in the contemplation of the great harmony, the universe, the all. But the stern realities of everyday, the orphan's cry, the widow's wail, the beggar's petition, the patriot's blood, the prayer for liberty on the lips of the serf, the gasp of the dying, and a thousand other griefs which appear to us all along the way through life, teach us that as philosophers we are cruel, unjust, inhuman.

We must live near the heart of humanity. We must sympathize with all who feel the heavy hand of sorrow. And when it comes to us, as come it will, we shall know better how to receive it, and how to interpret its meaning. It is not sufficient for us to cling to our faith in the goodness of God as displayed everywhere, even where we cannot trace it. We dare not flee from the problem of evil. We know that God takes no delight in the anguish of His creatures. Christ the Compassionate, the loving, heavenly One, came to save that which is lost. He healed the sick and the afflicted. He restored what was broken, and breathed the Holy Spirit into the darkness of the unconverted heart. Surely this settles the question concerning the source of all evil in the world, and intensifies our adoration of the unseen Maker of heaven and earth. We realize through His own revelation that He is kind and good. We are taught by the Prophet-Messiah that our God and Father purposes to harmonize the relations and to recompense the actions of mankind. Yea, more, we are led to see that a profound meaning and object underlie the great, the unconquerable, the universal fact of human suffering and pain.

Though the result of sin, they are made to contribute to the moral and spiritual growth of the heart and of the race. At times we deem them to be inconsistent with the perfections and omnipotent government of God. But in such moments we overlook the infinite wisdom of the heavenly Father, which lies back of all ill, and so rules the world of men that the imperfection and misfortune which human sin created, are turned from the path of destruction which they follow, and are forced to minister to the development and sanctification of Christian character and life. "And we know that all things work together for good to them that love God, to them who are the called according to His purpose."² Pain, suffering, toil, want, misfortunes of every description, therefore, have an ethical foundation. Suffering is not born of mere caprice. It is not pressed upon men mercilessly as the fruit of sin, to weigh them down without one spark of Divine compassion.

This law of the Kingdom of God, this spiritually defining moral power which prevents evil and ill from terminating in ultimate destruction, the ethics of suffering in other words, we propose as the subject of our inquiry. Since not any fact is more firmly established by experience than pain, both physical and mental, and that there is no exemption from it for any person by reason of station, temperament, or acquirements, the necessity of having correct ideas and well founded religious convictions concerning it becomes imperative.

The Scriptures teach us, and the Christian conscience lends assent to what they say, that there are two elements which constitute the ethics of suffering. The first is penal or retributive in its nature, and the second is corrective or educational.

I.

One fundamental teaching of the Bible, which, often in crude form, holds a prominent place in all religions, the doctrine namely that in human life there are punitive acts whose ultimate source is the Divine Justice, many deprecate

² Romans 8: 28.

and deny. It is declared to be inconsistent with the boundless goodness of God, and wherever it appears as an article of faith, as a principle or ruling motive of action among enlightened men and in their communities, it must be adjudged as a survival or revival of an ancient superstition. It cannot be denied that a great deal of bloodshed in the history of mankind grew out of false notions of justice. The judicial crimes committed by bigoted kings and fanatical religionists, resulted directly, without exception, from a usurpative, confusing, and unwarranted divorce between the providential acts and revelation of God, and the human conscience. By investing an ecclesiastical institution, whether identical with the State, or superior to it, with more than the guardianship of spiritual truth, by making it, in other words, the chief and final arbiter of human life, incalculable injury was done to the dissemination of right conceptions of the nature, extent, and ministration of primitive justice. The Scriptures themselves brand the charge brought against them that retribution is inconsistent with the goodness of God, as false, and prove the spirit of vengeance displayed in the whole history of mankind, including the cruel and bloody sacrifices offered upon the unholy altar of bigotry, to have been, and to be high crimes against the solemn truths of the Gospel, against the blessed life and example of Christ, for which an atonement will have to be made, if it has not yet been rendered, by the deluded men who perverted, and by those who continue to make a mockery of the principle of Christian liberty. "He was in the world, and the world was made by Him, and the world knew Him not."³ High over this vast tide of inhumanity, over the aberrations of power, and the criminal abuse of authority, resound in divine numbers the words of Almighty God, given to Moses as an everlasting statute, and reiterated by Saint Paul as a universal law of righteousness: "Dearly beloved, avenge not yourselves, but rather give place

³ St. John 1: 10.

unto wrath: for it is written, vengeance is mine; I will repay, saith the Lord."⁴

God speaks through the conscience. Every man bears about with him, in his own heart, a tribunal before which he is judged in this life, as to spiritual states, conditions and responsibility, both for their own sake, and in relation to conduct. The conscience may become seared and diseased through long indulgence in wickedness, but it is there, and sooner or later asserts itself. When it begins to stir, perhaps in the hour of danger or death, the grim spectres of transgression rise up before the soul to mock it, to dare it to repent, to pray, and to bring it the message of swift destruction. No, no, we cannot separate God from the heart of man, in a study of ethics. It is impossible to weigh correctly the moral attributes of the Almighty, apart from human needs, shortcomings, and transgressions. Just as mercy displays its holy, assuaging, pardoning, justifying power through the inner life of man, so justice declares itself through the conscience. "For when the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law, these having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another."⁵ In this fact then, that the heart of man, through the conscience, stands in direct communication with the moral Ruler of the universe, is to be found the penal element of suffering and pain.

An unregenerated heart neither loves nor obeys the precepts of God. It does not sustain harmonious relations to His moral government. Therefore it is in a state of rebellion against the kingdom of truth and righteousness. Now rebellion leads to defiant and continued transgression of all the laws of God, which obtain both in the material and spiritual world. If men wish to live to a ripe old age, and to spend the autumn of their days in contemplating with thankful

⁴ Deut. 32: 35; Romans 12: 19.

⁵ Romans 2: 14, 15.

contentment the achievements of the past, and in dwelling with expectant assurance upon the fast approaching glories of the life to come, they must vigilantly heed the laws of nature, and ever strive to keep them. If parents hope to be remembered by their children and children's children, to the latest generation, with unbroken blessing for pious example and ennobling influence, they must act in accordance with the constitution of the physical and moral world. The results of right living are always sure to manifest themselves. And these results are not confined to the prescribed limitations of isolated individuals. They extend further. They enter and act upon the broad stream of humanity, because mankind is a unit. "He gives to all life and breath in every respect, and has made of one blood every nation of men, to dwell on all the face of the earth."^a

That which is true concerning physical relations, applies in a far higher sense to psychical and spiritual activities. Contentment of soul, peace of heart, and the hope of ultimate salvation, increase in a ratio commensurate with the observance of the divine precepts, the imitation of Christ, and the enjoyment of the means of grace. Such is the constitution of nature and of mind that it becomes utterly impossible to break the laws which obtain in either sphere without calling forth dire and destructive consequences. Unnecessary exposure of the body, uncleanness, the use of ardent and intoxicating spirits as a beverage, vicious habits of every description, result finally in the undermining of health. By the law of heredity the sins of the parents in only too many instances are transmitted to their offspring. Thus whole families and generations are made unhappy, while death prematurely reaps a rich harvest among them. The physical equilibrium is

^a Acts 17: 25, 26. This thought of the unity of the human family is older than Saint Paul, but existed in pre-Christian heathen antiquity merely as a philosophical fragment, intimation, conjecture, and unconscious prophetic guess. The saying of Pindar: *αὐτὰρ ἀνδρῶν ἓν θεῶν γένος· ἐκ μῆος δὲ πρῶτον μάρτος ἀμφότεροι* essentially is monistic emanationism. Compare Sirach 40: 1.

disturbed, and the vital organs, before they succumb to the fell destroyer, in the process of failure and decay, set up a protest against the ravages of disease, and cause great anguish of body and of mind.

In like manner the transgression of moral law creates most deplorable conditions in the heart of man. Irreligion inevitably bears the fruit of remorse. One who wastes the golden opportunities offered by the Gospel, to live in its light and its holy promise, to teach, to preach, and to pray, will soon or late feel the heavy hand of unsanctifying sorrow, and receive the sting of hopeless regret. Man was fashioned a moral being. The whole end and aim of his existence, normally, is to glorify God and enjoy Him forever. When he fails to fulfill that high mission and destiny, to which he was appointed in the beginning by his Maker, he does violence to the laws of the spiritual realm to which he belongs, and will, if he persists in following the bypath of error, plunge into endless grief and shame. In looking upon the ruin he has wrought in his own heart, in contemplating the sad condition of his children and their offspring, their worthlessness and positive injury to the community in which they live, a feeling of deep despair will settle upon him, and he may be tempted to curse the day of his birth. This fact we know from observation, has its exceptions. Therefore we ought not to rush to a fatalistic extreme in the endorsement of the principle of hereditary transmission of evil.⁷ Some very good parents are

⁷ A curious and interesting trait in the character of Samuel Johnson, illustrative of the traditional biblical doctrine of the willfulness and guilt of sin, is described apologetically and apparently with a slight antinomian implication, by Boswell in his "Life of Doctor Johnson." "On that account, therefore, as well as from the regard to truth which he inculcated, I am to mention, with all possible respect and delicacy, however, that his conduct, after he came to London, and had associated with Savage and others, was not so strictly virtuous, in one respect, as when he was a younger man. In short, it must not be concealed, that like many other good and pious men, among whom we may place the apostle Paul upon his own authority, Johnson was not free from propensities which were ever 'warring against the law of his mind'—and that in his combats with them, he was sometimes overcome. Hence let the profane

troubled with unappreciative, ungovernable, and irreclaimable children. When a vicious character and life cannot be even partly accounted for by deficient ancestral antecedents, neither on the paternal nor the maternal side, the case is sporadic, in a sense a freakish manifestation of wickedness, but none the less in line with Adamic sin, and responsible to the moral law. The experiences of everyday offer numberless instances to prove the truth of these assertions. It is very plain to be seen that good results follow normal ways of thinking and living, and crown with blessing the career of the faithful, while evil consequences follow hard upon the heels of the workers of iniquity. Turn your eyes to the reform farms of the land, to the jails, and penitentiaries of every State in the Union, to the houses of correction, to the asylums for the insane and the imbecile in every civilized country on the globe, if you wish to see the bolder effects of sin. The first draught from the cup of transgression may be sweet and soothing, but its dregs are more poisonous than the sting of the asp. Who will, who can consistently deny that these harvests of good and evil, carrying with them as their inseparable attendants the sense of peace and the sense of guilt, are

and licentious pause. Let them not thoughtlessly say that Johnson was an *hypocrite*, or that his *principles* were not firm, because his *practice* was not uniformly conformable to what he professed. Let the question be considered independent of moral and religious association; and no man will deny that thousands, in many instances, act against conviction. Is a prodigal, for example, an *hypocrite*, when he owns he is satisfied that his extravagance will bring him to ruin and misery? We are sure he believes it; but immediate inclination, strengthened by indulgence, prevails over that belief in influencing his conduct. Why then shall credit be refused to the sincerity of those who acknowledge their persuasion of moral and religious duty, yet sometimes fail of living as it requires? But let no man encourage or soothe himself in 'presumptuous sin,' from knowing that Johnson was sometimes hurried into indulgences which he thought criminal. I have exhibited this circumstance as a shade in so great a character, both from my sacred love of truth, and to show that he was not so weakly scrupulous as he has been represented by those who imagine that the sins, of which a deep sense was upon his mind, were merely such little venial trifles as pouring milk into his tea on Good-Friday." (Boswell, "Life of Doctor Johnson," Vol. II., pp. 595, 596, Dutton & Co., New York.)

not rewards and punishments. The penal element is present in all suffering which in the least degree grows out of sin, however remote, refined, and imperceptible the latter may be. "Behold," says Solomon, "the righteous shall be recompensed in the earth; much more the wicked and the sinner."⁸

Lavater in his criticism of Holbein's painting of Judas says that there is a wonderful amount of realism in it, but that it lacks nobility. It is the true physiognomy of an avaricious man, but not of an avaricious apostle, of a base but not a great soul, which, seized by a mighty passion, becomes a satan indeed, while yet it continues to be great. We are not to laugh too soon at these strange combinations among the traits of human character. They are not taken out of the air. Judas is the basest of men, and yet a great man, for the Apostle can still be seen through the mantle of his misdeeds. Had Judas appeared as Holbein has painted him, Christ would surely not have chosen him as an apostle. A face like that cannot for a single week endure the presence of Jesus. Though it is the basest characterization that can be imagined, and much is still wanting to complete the expression of falsehood and flattering cunning, at the same time, as a picture, it is by far not good enough for the better side and the great talents of this apostolic personage.

Holbein's Judas is a thief, says Lavater, in whose soul deep anger has been aroused because none of the one hundred pieces of silver expended to purchase ointment for the Saviour, were to be given to him. He is capable of offering to barter away the best of men to his bitterest enemies, for a paltry sum of money. He lurks at the heels of large-hearted innocence. He sounds with cunning unrest the purpose of his Master. He asks with indescribable coldness: "Is it I?" He remains unmoved it seems, in the face of the most searching warning ever pronounced in ten or twelve words. Possessed by Satan, he assumes the leadership of the persecutors of his Lord, and gives to Him the most accursed of kisses. Of all these base deeds is that man capable, who, having such

⁸ Proverbs 11: 31.

a forehead and such lips, with this gaze looks into the face of Christ. But this brow, capable of so much baseness, will not soon again be lifted so high, to labor and battle, with the help of this noble power, against the many-sided stream of destroying thoughts. Judas has played the part of a devil, but he has acted like a devil who is sufficiently gifted to be an apostle.

Continuing the analysis, Lavater finally observes that now the terrible question may be asked: "In case a man comes into the world with such a brow, and with such culture, would it not be better if he had never been born? And is it his fault that he was born so?" Then the answer follows: No, it is not his fault, my friend, if he is born so; but he is not born in that condition, or state. He is born otherwise. These wrinkles and lines on his brow, this glance of calculating greed, are not native to him, as little as greed is a natural talent. Greed and its consequences grow out of habit. "But this forehead, this outline of the skull, what of these?" They also do not spring forth directly from the hand of nature, and foreheads which seem to bring into the world the fundamental elements of this form, have wrought themselves in the midst of the whole mass of tendencies and influences into the noblest, at least the bravest of mankind. And yet, if it is true that Judas appeared as Holbein has painted him; yes, if it could be proved that already at his birth he possessed all those principal features shown in the painting, even then it would be possible for Him who gives to men the great hope: "Behold, I make all things new!," to change this vessel of wrath into a vessel of honor. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God: how unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out!"⁹

II.

In addition to the retributive, there is present in suffering also an educational element. Trial and affliction uplift the human soul, give it a taste of, and an insight into the higher

⁹ Johann Kasper Lavater, "Ausgewaelte Schriften," Band I., Seite 90.

life. They widen its outlook, paradoxical as this may seem, by leading it into the valley of humiliation. Therefore those who have never felt the heart ache, who never have shed tears of disappointment over the blasting of their fondest hopes commit the sin of sacrilege against a most holy means of grace, when in haughtiness of spirit and in the coldness of unbelief they declare that trial, sorrow and tears are a standing indisputable evidence of an unjustifiable and unpardonable defect in the divine government. No doubt if sin had never entered the world, and the human family had remained free from its taint, the relations of things would have been different. But we are not here to fold our hands in idle murmurings regarding the past, and in bitter fruitless speculation as to what might have been. We move and have our being in the living present. We must rise to action, with a heart for any fate. "Courage in the face of danger, resignation before calamity, endurance in the path of duty in spite of any suffering that may be involved—these will always command the admiration of men; but empty suffering, with no necessity to explain it, or no high end to dignify it, is without moral contents."¹⁰ It is one of the most sacred obligations of our earthly mission to turn to spiritual account, to transform into the gold of heavenly longing and apprehension, all the experiences of life. Men who have suffered, women who have wept, and through their trials, tears, and purifying sorrows, have seen the light and the way which make for righteousness, bless the Name of the Lord God Almighty for the hallowing temptation and the refining humiliation which His Grace enabled them to endure.¹¹

One of the strongest of the passions—for there are many—which color the thought, govern the motives, and determine the actions of the natural man, is pride. The characteristic of self-sufficiency lies at the root and foundation, and is involved in the causes of all unbelief, worldly-mindedness and wickedness. Under the Eye of God its effects can be traced in every human life, with one sublime exception, from the days

¹⁰ Black, "Culture and Restraint," p. 250.

¹¹ I. Cor. 10: 13.

a forehead and such lips, with this gaze looks into the face of Christ. But this brow, capable of so much baseness, will not soon again be lifted so high, to labor and battle, with the help of this noble power, against the many-sided stream of destroying thoughts. Judas has played the part of a devil, but he has acted like a devil who is sufficiently gifted to be an apostle.

Continuing the analysis, Lavater finally observes that now the terrible question may be asked: "In case a man comes into the world with such a brow, and with such culture, would it not be better if he had never been born? And is it his fault that he was born so?" Then the answer follows: No, it is not his fault, my friend, if he is born so; but he is not born in that condition, or state. He is born otherwise. These wrinkles and lines on his brow, this glance of calculating greed, are not native to him, as little as greed is a natural talent. Greed and its consequences grow out of habit. "But this forehead, this outline of the skull, what of these?" They also do not spring forth directly from the hand of nature, and foreheads which seem to bring into the world the fundamental elements of this form, have wrought themselves in the midst of the whole mass of tendencies and influences into the noblest, at least the bravest of mankind. And yet, if it is true that Judas appeared as Holbein has painted him; yes, if it could be proved that already at his birth he possessed all those principal features shown in the painting, even then it would be possible for Him who gives to men the great hope: "Behold, I make all things new!," to change this vessel of wrath into a vessel of honor. "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God: how unsearchable are His judgments and His ways past finding out!"⁹

II.

In addition to the retributive, there is present in suffering also an educational element. Trial and affliction uplift the human soul, give it a taste of, and an insight into the higher

⁹ Johann Kaspar Lavater, "*Ausgewaelte Schriften*," Band I., Seite 90.

life. They widen its outlook, paradoxical as this may seem, by leading it into the valley of humiliation. Therefore those who have never felt the heart ache, who never have shed tears of disappointment over the blasting of their fondest hopes commit the sin of sacrilege against a most holy means of grace, when in haughtiness of spirit and in the coldness of unbelief they declare that trial, sorrow and tears are a standing indisputable evidence of an unjustifiable and unpardonable defect in the divine government. No doubt if sin had never entered the world, and the human family had remained free from its taint, the relations of things would have been different. But we are not here to fold our hands in idle murmurings regarding the past, and in bitter fruitless speculation as to what might have been. We move and have our being in the living present. We must rise to action, with a heart for any fate. "Courage in the face of danger, resignation before calamity, endurance in the path of duty in spite of any suffering that may be involved—these will always command the admiration of men; but empty suffering, with no necessity to explain it, or no high end to dignify it, is without moral contents."¹⁰ It is one of the most sacred obligations of our earthly mission to turn to spiritual account, to transform into the gold of heavenly longing and apprehension, all the experiences of life. Men who have suffered, women who have wept, and through their trials, tears, and purifying sorrows, have seen the light and the way which make for righteousness, bless the Name of the Lord God Almighty for the hallowing temptation and the refining humiliation which His Grace enabled them to endure.¹¹

One of the strongest of the passions—for there are many—which color the thought, govern the motives, and determine the actions of the natural man, is pride. The characteristic of self-sufficiency lies at the root and foundation, and is involved in the causes of all unbelief, worldly-mindedness and wickedness. Under the Eye of God its effects can be traced in every human life, with one sublime exception, from the days

¹⁰ Black, "Culture and Restraint," p. 250.

¹¹ I. Cor. 10: 13.

of Adam to the present hour. As a motive power it lies back of innumerable deeds and activities which grow out of the social relations of mankind in the family, in the church, and in the state. Scarcely is a child born into the world, when it already betrays the presence of this fleshly weakness, however elemental its manifestation may be. Never does a man become too old to be deceived by its subtle impulses, exactions, and influence. It is found in every form and degree among mankind, from unveiled offensive grossness, to keen, calculating, polished, politic, and refined suavity, the *crème de la crème* of selfish self-sufficiency, posing in the mask of tenderness, mercy, and truth, as the lover of God, the disciple of Christ, and the friend of men.

How insolent is upstart pride!
 Hadst thou not thus, with insult vain,
 Provok'd my patience to complain,
 I had conceal'd thy meaner birth,
 Nor trac'd thee to the scum of earth.¹²

Only the all-seeing eye of an Eternal Judge can follow the ranges of self-exaltation in which the human heart indulges. Out of it grow tyrannies, persecutions, denials of God, revilements of truth, backbitings, deceptions, and jealousies. It is the fruitful soil of many a transgression and the background of many a crime. Wherever it holds sway it causes men to be distrustful and unhappy, because it leads to universal sacrifice for the sake of self-interest. It is king in the realm of the negative.

The infernal Serpent; he it was, whose guile,
 Stirr'd up with envy and revenge, deceived
 The mother of mankind: what time his pride
 Had cast him out of heaven, with all his host
 Of rebel angels; by whose aid, aspiring,
 To set himself in glory above his peers,
 He trusted to have equal'd the Most High,
 If he opposed; and, with ambitious aim
 Against the throne and monarchy of God,
 Raised impious war in heaven, and battle proud,
 With vain attempt.¹³

¹² Gay, "Fables," Pt. I., Fable 24.

¹³ Milton, "Paradise Lost," Book I., line 34.

In this world the human heart is the seat of this blighting form of the mystery of evil. The remedy for it must be applied to every human being singly and alone, as if every individual soul were distinguished from every other by this disturbing principle, and the restoration of order throughout the universe depended upon the banishment of the passion from that one soul. The angels in heaven rejoice over one repentant sinner. There is no other help for it than the overthrow of pride through the instrumentality of humiliation and sorrow. There may be exceptions to the rule, but it does seem that preliminary providential leadings through the dark valley of trial, in which the heart becomes conscious of the touch of the great Under-arm,¹⁴ are necessary to break all false and unworthy self-reliance.¹⁵ Brought to a realization of absolute dependence upon a Power not itself, and feeling the crushing weight of woe the suffering soul, if not frenzied by a demon, will cry out: "What is man that Thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that Thou visitest him!" Trial, especially that type of it which possesses the quality of vicariousness, changes and deepens the sympathies, clarifies the moral vision, converts, and spiritualizes. It saves men from themselves. It causes pride to vanish like the mist of early morning. It fits the heart for the indwelling of Christ and His spirit.

But affliction does more. While it robs the soul of all false self-reliance, it does not leave it shorn of all power whatsoever.

¹⁴ Psalm 23.

¹⁵ Dr. McCosh says of pride and humiliation: "In the former, we form and cherish and entertain a high and self-satisfied opinion of ourselves, of our abilities, of our conduct, or of certain qualities supposed to be possessed by us, or of certain acts we have done. In the latter, we are not satisfied with ourselves, we do not believe we have qualifications for certain offices, and we depreciate what we have done. The one state, when it is self-righteous, may become a sin offensive to God, and *self-conceit* denounced by man; the other, if it is yielded to, and not counteracted by a sense of duty, may become a *poorness of spirit* which prevents us from engaging in anything that requires courage and perseverance. The one, if we dwell only on the good qualities we possess, may become *self-respect* to keep us from what is mean and unworthy; the other, when it leads us to take a lowly attitude before God and our fellowmen, may become the grace of *humility*." (McCosh, "The Motive Powers," pp. 107, 108.)

New energies are awakened. New capacities and capabilities are called into being and reveal themselves to the eye of the inner consciousness. By this we mean that stage in the development of the *self* where it secures command of better things in its own new world of the higher life. Holy emotions start into action and reach out to meet the love of God. Sympathies as large as the human family envelop the heart. A zeal to bring sacrifices for the benefit of mankind, sets it all aflame. A sacred longing to achieve something permanent in the cause of truth, righteousness, and salvation, asserts dominion, in the name of God, over every other impulse. A heart bowed down with grief, and purified by sorrow, when the shadows lift, becomes pious and poetic. It seeks utterance through the medium of the true, the beautiful, and the good. Its language is art, its food is religion, its home is God. When Beethoven found that he was growing deaf, he became very melancholy and shunned the companionship of his fellow-men. His affliction almost drove him to suicide, but the love of his art, and the voice of conscience restrained him from committing so dreadful a deed. His greatest works, the concertos and symphonies, *Fidelio*, *Prometheus*, and *Mount of Olives* were all composed after he had grown totally deaf. His affliction led him to choose Patience as his daily companion, and isolation undoubtedly made possible the concentration of mind, under the sway of genius, necessary to call forth those kingly harmonies which could be created only through silent communion with God. They are raptures transported from the Unseen.

Had he not been blind, John Milton might never have written *Paradise Lost*. An immortal confession which fell from his pen, reveals to us how great was the sanctifying influence of the affliction he humbly bore for many years, a deprivation which he felt all the more keenly because of the unfortunate character of his domestic surroundings.

I am old and blind—

Men point at me as smitten by God's frown,

Afflicted and deserted of my kind.

Yet I am not cast down.

I am weak, yet strong;
I murmur not that I no longer see;
Poor, old, and helpless, I the more belong,
Father supreme to Thee.

Thy glorious face
Is beaming towards me, and its holy light
Shines in upon my lonely dwelling place,
And there is no more night.

On my bended knee
I recognize Thy purpose, clearly shown;
My vision Thou hast dimmed, that I may see,
Thyself; Thyself alone.

Visions come and go;
Shapes of resplendent beauty round me throng,
From angel lips I seem to hear the flow
Of soft and holy song.¹⁶

If the life-history of all true men of God were minutely recorded and lay before us, so that we might trace the growth of those personalities, we would find in every instance that changes for the better, toward broader views of men and things began in some hour of crucial sorrow. In the darkness and the doubt the old pride is abandoned, the false self-reliance and self-sufficiency are uprooted, or slain, that a higher self, with concentrated moral energy, may step into the light to act a hero's part for truth, with a heaven-born sense of obligation to the larger purposes of God, and of duty to the erring race of man. The cross of pain and humiliation helps the soul to understand the words uttered by Jesus, when, as part of the act of restoration to the Apostolate, He recommissioned Saint Peter, saying: Feed my lambs! Feed my sheep!¹⁷

The early Christian martyrs, both men and women, thanked God for the crowning glory of immolation which persecution brought them, and blessed the Name of Jesus because they were judged to be worthy to share His pain. The intense interest in

¹⁶ The poem in full consists of seven stanzas, and is found only in the first edition of Milton's works.

¹⁷ St. John 21: 15.

her erring son, and her invincible faith, taught Monica, the mother of St. Augustine, absolute reliance upon God. After a discipline of more than nine long years, her prayers were finally answered, and her storm-tossed faith was crowned with joy. A few days before her death, in middle life, while visiting her son at Ostia, on the Tiber, she said to him: "My son, as for myself, I delight no longer in anything in this life. What yet here I may do, and why I linger here, I know not, now that the hope of this life has died within me. There was but one thing for which I longed to tarry here a while, that I might see thee a Catholic Christian before my death. And this my God hath given me even more abundantly, so that I even see thee His servant, and able to despise mere earthly happiness. What do I here?"¹⁸

As affliction disciplines, so poverty awakens to better purposes the affections, desires, and aspirations of the soul. It teaches men to labor and to wait. Nearly all the great men the world thus far has seen, and whose influence for good it has felt most, came from the ranks of the lowly and the poor. J. G. Holland, the American humanitarian, thanked God that he had not been born in affluence. The whole of human experience, if studied in the right light, though it is impossible to understand and to explain every manifestation of affliction and trial, since the eye of reason cannot follow the winding course of cause and effect everywhere, proves that disappointment, sorrow and suffering contain a mighty educational element whose purposes touch the eternities. "In view of the utilities of natural death which are coming to be known, we may the more confidently conclude that the Creator will never need to apologize to the creation for having permitted the door for the entrance of natural evil to stand open for a while into nature. For it has been opened for life's sake."¹⁹ "For our light affliction," says Saint Paul, "which is but for a moment, worketh for us a far more exceeding and eternal weight of glory."²⁰

¹⁸ "The Confessions of St. Augustine," Chapter 10.

¹⁹ Newman Smyth, "The Place of Death in Evolution," pp. 55, 56.

²⁰ II. Cor. 4: 17. See also Ps. 34: 19; I. Peter 1:7.

The disciples of our Lord, whenever the afflictions of the people of God were pointed out to them in a special way, as was often the case, directed the eyes of the weary, weeping, and stricken ones to the Saviour of the world. To them He was the ideal sufferer. His wounds were holy. His cry of distress was an intercession. His tears were tears of infinite tenderness, love, and sympathy. His humiliation was the gateway, the outer court to His exaltation. His sacrificial death served to reconcile the world to God by expiating its guilt. "For it became Him, for whom are all things, and by whom are all things, in bringing many sons unto glory, to make the captain of their salvation perfect through suffering."²¹ "For in that He himself hath suffered being tempted, He is able to succor them that are tempted."²² "Though He were a Son, yet learned He obedience by the things which He suffered, and being made perfect, He became the Author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey Him."²³ Christ's work of expiation, His mission of reconciliation, His life of sorrow and obedience, found their consummation in the return to the Father's throne in glory. The idea the ancients had of sin, and the interpretation they placed upon pain and suffering, notably in the heathen world, were both inadequate and far behind the truth. Plato wrote as follows: "Those who are punished by gods and men, and improved, are those whose sins are curable; still the way of improving them, as in this world so also in another, is by pain and suffering; for there is no other way in which they can be delivered from their evil."²⁴ The Buddhist system lacks the biblical idea of conscience, as well as the Christian idea of sin, as a deep moral estrangement from, and inevitable responsibility to a supernatural, a divine Person. Hence there the finding of happiness consists in recession from the world, and a withdrawal into a state of dreamy non-resisting quiescence.²⁵ Thus, in Christianity, as in none of the

²¹ Hebrews 2: 10.

²² Hebrews 2: 18.

²³ Hebrews 5: 8, 9.

²⁴ Jowett's "Plato," Gorgias 534.

²⁵ Bishop Copleston, "Buddhism," p. 99.

ethnic faiths, and in a sense wholly its own, is there this upward flight from sanctifying depths to glorified heights, the veritable apotheosis of suffering.

In all the penal anguish, in all the affliction which men experience, by which at times their hearts are paralyzed, as they stand upon the brink of darkness, but which are meant to train them in faith, in obedience, and in holy love, they must fix their eyes upon the Crucified One. "It is a faithful saying: For if we be dead with Him, we shall also live with Him; if we suffer, we shall also reign with Him; if we deny Him, He also will deny us."²⁸ Pass through the crucible fearlessly. Bear the penitential grief patiently. Lift your soul to Heaven's throne with trust unshaken. Perform humbly, but obediently the work thy hands are given to do. Strike the heart's harp of a thousand emotions in the power of the Spirit of God. Let angelic voices dictate the songs that fall from the lips of faith and praise. Help to call multitudes away from the danger stations and the waste places, out of sin and sorrow into the joy of God's redeeming love. In wandering through the dark valley, lean upon the great Underarm. We weep now. Later on we shall rejoice. We bear a cross here. Yonder we shall wear a crown. On earth fierce conflict, trial and pain engage us. In Heaven we shall join in the peans of victory which rise up forever before the face of Him who made us and built for us a City of Peace.

TIFFIN, OHIO.

* II. Timothy 2: 11, 12.

VI

IS THE BEST IN BURNS TYPICALLY SCOTCH?¹

BY REV. E. S. BROMER, D.D.

This question seems to bear in it the implication that the poetry of Robert Burns is so Scottish in spirit, so reveals the poet himself as a Scotchman and is so associated with the moors and fens, lochs and streams, banks and braes and highlands of his good, bonnie Scotland as to circumscribe his name and fame within these national limits.

There is much to be said in favor of the implication. Robert Burns was truly a Scotchman. His poetry can only be understood and appreciated when viewed and studied as the product of Scottish life and environment. His fidelity to his native dialect lifted it into literary standing and recognition. His genius also won for Scottish ballads a place in the literature of the world. His patriotism made him the idol of his countrymen. He never lived beyond the boundaries of his native land and rarely visited even England. His once projected emigration to Jamaica was thwarted by his sudden rise to fame among his own countrymen. He was, therefore, a thoroughgoing Scotchman, whether studied from the point of view of his personality, his work or his residence. He is well known as "the national poet of Scotland."

A brief sketch of his life will confirm the implication that the best in Burns is typically Scotch. He was born January 25, 1759, about two miles from Ayr. His father was a yeoman farmer, whose life was one of long struggle and many misfortunes, but who, despite these handicaps succeeded in

¹ This paper was prepared for the Adelphi Club of Greensburg, Pa., and read before the club at an open meeting of January 25, 1909, the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the birth of Robert Burns. On the program of the evening it was preceded by an essay on "Robert Burns and the Scottish Bards," by Professor C. R. Fisher, hence the abrupt beginning of this paper.

giving his children a creditable education and a legacy of faithfulness and piety. The poet was of robust frame and active body, having withal a vigorous intellect and acute sensibilities. As early as fifteen years he was made to do the work of a full-grown man.

Like Sappho of old, Burns learned to sing his songs through love, his first experience being at Mt. Oliphant, whither his father had moved, when he fell in love with a "bonnie, sweet, sonsie lassie" and gave utterance to his passion in the poem—"Handsome Nell." Love was both his making and unmaking. The gentle goddess during his innocent growing years led him to his best ideals and noblest efforts, but in the days after his sojourn in Irvine, when he adopted more liberal ideas and a looser life, she led him into much misery and many a fool's errand. With his unreined passions went the lust of intemperance. Amid these two evil tendencies neither his early piety nor his sturdy Scotch conscience could be overwhelmed. His better moments are always true to the higher ideals of humanity.

After his father's death Robert and his brother Gilbert moved to a farm at Mossiel which they had rented a short time before. Their hard labors here were hardly more remunerative than elsewhere, and it was clearly demonstrated that Robert was no farmer but evidently a poet of great promise. Here too his weaknesses of character showed themselves in the most glaring manner. During these Mossiel years he wrote many poems and got into much trouble through his way of living and writing. In 1785 he formed a liaison (which was, according to the usage of Scotland, virtually a marriage) with Jean Armour, a person somewhat above his station in life. She bore him twins. The resentment of her father against the poet made all efforts of publicly acknowledging the marriage temporarily a failure. Finally the poet in discouragement and desperation planned to emigrate to the new world. Before completing the arrangements and with a view of raising funds he published his first edition of poems,

which netted him twenty pounds. Their success was at once pronounced and immediate. He changed his plans and decided to remain at home. The following chapters of his life are given by Principal Shairp in his biography as follows: First Winter in Edinburgh, Border and Highland Tours, second Winter in Edinburgh, Life at Ellisland, Migration to Dumfries and Last Years.

It was in 1788 that he openly declared his marriage with Jean Armour. About the same time he received his appointment as an officer in the excise with a salary of 50 pounds a year, which was later raised to 75 pounds. His intemperate habits, irregular life and pecuniary distress finally overwhelmed him and he died in July 21, 1796.

In emphasizing the primary elements of his character and work, we find it is true that the best in Burns is Scotch. The contradiction beteen his genius as a poet and his weakness of character as a man makes a painful tragedy. Despite all this he is the man and poet whom the peasantry of Scotland loved as no other. He interpreted their wants, trials, joys, sorrows and obscure lot. He glorified their own homely language and revealed its musical sweetness to the world. He stirred their deepest depth through their simple elemental human sympathies.

Not only so, but he is the restorer of Scotland's nationality. At a time when leading Scotchmen aped French life and ideas and were despised by Englishmen in general, Burns aroused the native spirit of the people. Into the midst of the literary circle and learned cosmopolitans of Edinburgh walked the poet ploughman and made the Scottish life they ignored and the language they despised the subject of his poetry and conversation. The ancient spirit, almost quenched, revived and spread with almost electric speed and power. On this rising tide the poet was borne to popularity and fame. To-day he is acknowledged as "the national poet."

Is the best of Burns Scotch? Yes, we answer, but because it is truly Scotch in its primal elements, it is human and universal.

In a general way there are two types of poets, the objective and the subjective. The former is impersonal and descriptive; the latter is personal and introspective. The one requires little or no knowledge of the poet and his surroundings to be understood; the other demands the poet's intimate acquaintance and an introduction to his neighbors and surroundings in order to be best appreciated. The typical example of the former is Shakespeare, of the latter is Browning. It is to the second that Robert Burns belongs. You recognize Chaucer in his gracious wit and humor, Milton in his Puritan firmness, Pope in his modish regularity, Burns in his amorous ditties, convivial and patriotic songs, in his struggles with debt and nature, in his piety, his sense of oneness with both the land and the common people.

This side of our question is plainly understood and in most of the estimates made of Burns and his poetry is quite generally accepted. But we wish in this paper to try to show that in being true to the common elements of Scottish scenery and life and himself as a Scotchman, our poet rises truly to the realm of the universal experience of the race. So that it may be said of him that the best in Burns is not typically Scotch, but human. He uses, as it were, Scottish pigments and canvas, scenery and life, but the motive and moral and spirit of the picture are natural, human and universal. He has the point of view of the Scotch peasant, but his vision is of man—

A man is a man for a' that.

He himself is always a poet, but more than a poet, for he knew men and nature. His point of contact with life was with the common people of his own country, but the current of his own being touches poor, struggling humanity wherever man is found. Though the fragrance of the highland heather and rose-hue of its bloom is found in his poems and songs, the heart of universal nature throbs in unison with the reader's. Though you hear the lowing of the cattle on the hills of Scotland, the call of the plough boy, the jesting of the crude farm hands, you feel the life blood quickened in your own veins. Though

his love affairs are many and various, his struggles with himself are long and hard, though his defeats and victories are peculiarly his own, yet who can fail to see in them all the simple elements of human life.

Ruskin defines the art of literature as "writing as you see." If this is an adequate definition, then Burns is a master; for the one basic element of power in his poetry is his absolute truthfulness, coupled with an intense sense of reality. He is truthful to the objects he saw and to himself as the seer of them. It is in this way he rises to catholicity, *i. e.*, through absolute fidelity and truthfulness to the peasantry of Scotland he strikes the simple, fundamental experiences of the universal man. In this he is unlike Browning, Goethe or Shakespeare. Their way of approach and expression was very different. Burns is always the Scotchman, never the cosmopolitan. The genuinely concrete is always an emblem of the universal. As one of his biographers says:

Reality, the most intense human reality, substantiality of the most solid contents, is the stuff of which his verses are made (Blackie).

We, therefore, as suggested above, view the best in Burns as typically Scotch, but that which is thus typically Scotch is not the best in Burns. He goes beyond the Scotchman to that which makes the Scotchman a part of the human race. He sees the streams, banks, braes and highlands of Scotland, but these are, however, only the drapery of the universal spirit, fit settings for the life of man as man.

We will briefly illustrate our point of view by references which show his touch with nature, his sympathies with animal life, his fidelity to Scotch life, customs and manners, his insight into human nature and his faith in God.

With nature he lived at first hand. His love for her is intense but simple as a child's. There is none of the later Wordsworthian adoration or philosophizing subtilty which so became the vogue during and after the rise of the evolutionary view of science. For refreshment and sympathy he goes out in the world of fresh air, hills, streams, meadows,

clouds and sunshine. For him nature is never a thing apart from man. It is but part of the universal life and given especially as the background of the greater pictures of life and human character.

Out of many examples we select but two or three.

In "The Brigs of Ayr" he sees and feels his oneness as a poet with nature's own sympathetic self and revels in her freedom.

The simple Bard, rough at the rustic plough,
Learning his tuneful trade from ev'ry bough:
The chanting linnnet, or the mellow thrush:
Hailing the setting sun, sweet, in the green thorn bush:
The soaring lark, the perching red-breast shrill,
Or deep-ton'd plovers, grey, wild-whistling o'er the hill
Shall he, nurst in the Peasant's lowly shed,
To hardy independence bravely bred,
By early poverty to hardship steel'd,
And trained to arms in stern Misfortune's field;
Shall he be guilty of their hireling crimes,
The servile mercenary Swiss of rhymes?

It is thus that he makes his protest against the formality of Pope and Dryden before ever John Keats came to break the spell and give English poetry its rebirth of freedom.

And again he says:

'Twas when the stacks get on their winter hap,
And thack and rape secure the toil-won crap;
Potatoe-bings are snugged up frae skaith
O' coming Winter's biting, frosty breath;
The bees, rejoicing o'er their summer toils,
Unnumber'd, buds as Flow'rs, delicious spoils,
Seal'd up with frugal care in massive waxen piles,
Are doom'd by Man, that tyrant o'er the weak,
The death o' devils, smoor'd wi' brimstone reek;
The thund'ring guns are heard on ev'ry side,
The wounded coveys, reeling, scatter wide;
The feather'd field-mates, bound by Nature's tie,
Sires, mothers, children, in one carnage lie:
What warm, poetic heart, but inly bleeds,
And execrates man's savage, ruthless deeds!
Nae mair the flow'r in field or meadow springs:
Nae mair the grove with airy concert rings,
Except perhaps the Robin's whistling glee,

Proud o' the height o' some bit half-lang tree;
The hoary morns precede the sunny days,
Mild, calm, serene, wide spreads the noontide blaze,
While thick the gossamour waves wanton in the rays.

Another suggestive example is the following verse from *Hallowe'en*:

Whyles owre a linn the burnie plays,
As thro' the glen it wimpl't;
Whyles round a rocky-scar it strays;
Whyles in a wiel it dimpl't;
Whyles glitter'd to the nightly rays,
Wi' bickering, dancing, dazzle;
Whyles cookit underneath the braes,
Below the spreading hazel,
Unseen that night.

We rise a step in his warm sympathy with nature when we speak of the flowers. They always touched him deeply. "To a Mountain Daisy" is but one among many examples. Who can fail to feel keenly these opening lines:

Wee, modest, crimson-tipped flow'r,
Thou's met me in an evil hour;
For I maun crush amang the stoure
Thy slender stem.
To spare thee now is past my pow'r,
Thou bonie gem.

This same poem in the second verse leads us to his relation to animals and his intimate knowledge of animal life, when he says:

Alas! it's no thy neebor sweet,
The bonie lark, companion meet!
Bending thee 'mang the dewy weet!
Wi' spreckl'd breast,
When upward-springing, blythe, to greet
The purpling east.

Man's relation to animals always reveals two aspects of his life. They are either friends or enemies. With Burns the later evolutionary conception of the survival of the fittest was impossible. Tennyson, the scientific poet of the nineteenth century, might say,

Arise and fly
 The reeling Fawn, the sensual feast:
 Move upward, working out the beast,
 And let the ape and tiger die.

but with Burns the animals are rather companions enduring with man the same struggles and disappointments. "The Twa Dogs," one of the best of his poems, is in reality a keen discussion of gentry and the peasant life, of which the dogs are as truly a part as the nobles and farmers of his day. His two poems "To a Mouse" and the other "To a Louse" show both the sympathetic seriousness and the jolly humorous side of his view of animal life.

THE MOUSE.

Wee, sleekit, cow'rin, tim'rous beastie,
 O, what a panic's in thy breastie!
 Thou need na start awa sae hasty,
 Wi' bickering brattle!
 I wad be laith to rin an' chase thee,
 Wi' murd'ring pattle!

I'm truly sorry man's dominion
 Has broken Nature's social union,
 An' justifies that ill opinion,
 Which makes thee startle,
 At me, thy poor, earth-born companion,
 An' fellow-mortal!

I doubt na, whiles, but thou may thieve;
 What then? poor beastie, thou maun live;
 A daimen-icker in a thrave
 'S a sma' request;
 I'll get a blessin wi' the lave,
 And never miss 't!

Thy wee bit housie, too, in ruin!
 Its silly wa's the win's are strewin!
 An' naething, now, to big a new ane,
 O'foggage green!
 An' bleak December's winds ensuin,
 Baith snell an' keen!

Thou saw the fields laid bare and waste,
 An' weary winter comin fast,

An' cozie here, beneath the blast,
Thou thought to dwell,
Till crash! the cruel coulter past,
Out thro' thy cell.

That wee bit heap o' leaves an' stibble,
Has cost thee mony a weary nibble!
Now thou's turn'd out, for a' thy trouble,
But house or hald,
To thole the winter's sleety dribble,
An' cranreuch cauld!

But, Mousie, thou art no thy lane,
In proving foresight may be vain;
The best laid schemes o' mice an' men
Gang aft a-gley,
An' lea'e us nought but grief an' pain,
For promis'd joy.

Still thou art blest, compar'd wi' me!
The present only toucheth thee;
But, Och! I backward cast my e'e
On prospects drear!
An' forward, tho' I canna see,
I guess an' fear.

It seems a violation of the rule of proportion to quote this and the following poem—"The Louse"—at length, but they are so *a propos* to our purpose and so typical of Burns at his best that we freely presume on your judgment and patience.

THE LOUSE.

Ha! where ye gaun, ye crowlin ferlie!
Your impudence protects you sairly:
I canna say but ye strunt rarely,
Owre gauze and lace;
Tho' faith, I fear ye dine but sparely
On sic a place.

Ye ugly, creepin, blastit wonner,
Detested, shunn'd by saunt an' sinner,
How dare ye set your fit upon her,
Sae fine a lady!
Gae somewhere else, and seek your dinner
On some poor body.

Is the Best in Burns Typically Scotch?

Swith, in some beggar's haffet squattle;
 There ye may creep, and sprawl, and sprattle
 Wi' ither kindred, jumping cattle,
 In shoals and nations;
 Whare horn nor bane ne'er dare unsettle
 Your thick plantations.

Now haud ye there, ye're out o' sight,
 Below the fatt'rels, snug an' tight;
 Na, faith ye yet! ye'll no be right
 Till ye've got on it,
 The vera tapmost, tow'ring height
 O' Miss's bonnet.

My sooth! right bauld ye set your nose out,
 As plump and gray as onie grozet;
 O for some rank, mercurial rozet,
 Or fell, red smeddum,
 I'd gie you sic a hearty doze o't,
 Wad dress your droddum!

I wad na been surpris'd to spy
 You on an auld wife's flainen toy;
 Or aiblins some bit duddie boy,
 On's wyliecoat;
 But Miss's fine Lunardi! fie,
 How daur ye do 't!

O, Jenny, dinna toss your head,
 An' set your beauties a' abroad!
 Ye little ken what cursed speed
 The blastie's makin!
 Thae winks and finger-ends, I dread,
 Are notice takin!

O wad some Pow'r the giftie give us
 To see oursel's as others see us!
 It wad frae monie a blunder free us
 And foolish notion;
 What airs in dress an' gait wad lea'e us,
 And ev'n Devotion!

Other poems of similar significance are "The Auld Farmer's New Year Morning Salutation to His Auld Mare, Maggie," "On Scaring Some Water Fowl in Loch-Turit," etc.

When we come to his descriptions of Scottish life, customs

and manners we find it difficult, within our time limits, to arrange our material to advantage because of its abundance. His poems and songs are the finest portrayal of the land and the common people to be found in the language. It is here we find his truthfulness most manifest. For a picture of the pious, old-type Scotch family what could be more beautiful than "The Cotter's Saturday Night"? The contrast of the life of the peasantry and the aristocrats is most characteristically set forth in "The Twa Dogs." "Hallowe'en" abounds in references to Scottish life and customs. "The Holy Fair," "Address to the Unco' Guid and Rigidly Righteous" and "Holy Willie's Prayer" are illustrations of the religious tendencies of his day, revealing the fray between the Moderates and the Evangelicals. He is noted for his moral raillery against the "Holy Willie" type, and is often charged with sacrilege and blasphemy. "The Holy Fair," no doubt, is the poem most severe on the New Light people, and to this day offends the sense of propriety in a great many of his readers. For a most refreshing view of the farmer and his simple life one should read "The Auld Farmer's Address to His Auld Mare Maggie," "The Ploughman," "The Cotter's Saturday Night." Besides there are numerous indirect references which yield glimpses of the life of the farmer.

In general it may be said that Burns knew the life of the common people in all its phases. From "The Jolly Beggar" to "The Holy Fair" he runs the whole gamut of common life. The frieze of the Parthenon is no more beautiful panorama of Greek life than the poems and songs of Robert Burns are of life, customs and manners of Scotland's common people.

Burns as a student of human nature was preëminent. He knew men—all sorts of men. Those who revelled with him in Poosie Nancy's Inn, those whom he described in "The Jolly Beggars" were but brothers after all with them who lived in better style and nobler manner. Man as man was Burns' passion. It is here perhaps more than anywhere else that we catch his spirit as a poet. His use of nature and his sympathy

with birds and animals were but ways and means of setting forth the humanity of man, and among men he most loved the poor who languished in the huts of Scotland's peasantry. To them he gave a voice, in them he aroused a new spirit of hope and recognition; with them he lived and nothing could induce him to forsake them. In being true to them he brings clearly to view the deep foundation springs of the human heart. Through them he rises to a true sense of that which is universal in man as man.

Is there, for honest poverty,
That hangs his head, and a' that;
The coward-slave, we pass him by,
We dare be poor for a' that!
For a' that, and a' that,
Our toil's obscure, and a' that;
The rank is but the guinea's stamp,
The man's the gowd for a' that.

What though on hamely fare we dine,
Wear hodden grey, and a' that;
Gi'e Fools their silks, and knaves their wine,
A man's a man for a' that;
For a' that, and a' that,
Their tinsel show, and a' that;
The honest man, though e'er sae poor,
Is king of men for a' that.

Ye see yon birkie, ca'd a lord,
Wha struts and stares, and a' that;
Though hundreds worship at his word,
He's but a coof for a' that;
For a' that, and a' that,
His riband star, and a' that:
The man of independent mind
He looks and laughs at a' that.

A prince can mak' a belted knight,
A marquis duke, and a' that;
But an honest man's aboon his might—
Guid faith he mauna fa' that!
For a' that, and a' that,
Their dignities, and a' that,
The pith o' sense and pride o' worth
Are higher ranks than a' that.

Then let us pray that come it may,
As come it will for a' that,
That sense and worth, o'er a' the earth,
May bear the gree and a' that.
For a' that, and a' that,
It's coming yet, for a' that,
That man to man, the world o'er,
Shall brothers be for a' that.

Through his idea of man to man in his essential elements, however, simple and plain, he attains his insight into human hearts. Blackie, one of his biographers, says:

If inferior to Coleridge in ideal speculation, to Wordsworth in harmonious contemplation and to Southey in book learning, in all that concerns living men and human life and human society, he was extremely sharp sighted, and not only wise in penetration to the inmost springs of human thought and sentiment, but in judgment of conduct eminently shrewd and sagacious: gifted in the highest degree with that fundamental virtue of all sound Scotchmen, common sense, without which great genius in full career is apt to lead a man astray from his surroundings and make him most a stranger to that with which in common life he ought to be most familiar.

We have noted that Burns is effective because he knows and is true to common life. The point of contact between it and the higher universal life of men is warm and real. We will illustrate with but a few examples, reviewing life along the general lines radiating from his own personal center, namely, the social, political and religious.

The phases in his social life selected are home-life, the former, the lover, etc.

The cheerfu' supper done, wi' serious face,
They 'round the ingle, form a circle wide;
The sire turns o'er, wi' patriarchal grace,
The big ha'-Bible, ance his father's pride:
His bonnet rev'rently is laid aside,
His lyart haffets wearing thin an' bare;
Those strains that once did sweet in Zion glide,
He wales a portion with judicious care,
And "Let us worship God!" he says, with solemn air.

.

Is the Best in Burns Typically Scotch?

From scenes like these old Scotia's grandeur springs,
 That makes her lov'd at home, rever'd abroad:
 Princes and lords are but the breath of kings,
 "An honest man's the noblest work of God:
 And certes, in fair virtues heavenly road,
 The cottage leaves the palace far behind;
 What is a lordling's pomp? a cumbrous load,
 Disguising oft the wretch of human kind,
 Studied in arts of hell, in wickedness refin'd."

The Song of the Ploughman shows Burns in his native element. He himself in a letter to a certain Mr. Miller declares:

I want to be a farmer on a small farm, about a plough-gang, in a pleasant country, under the auspices of a good landlord. I have no foolish notion of being a tenant on easier terms than another. To find a farm where one can live at all is not easy. I only mean living soberly, like an old style farmer, and joining personal industry.

The ploughman he's a bonnie lad,
 His mind is ever true, jo,
 His garters knit below his knee,
 His bonnet it is blue, jo.

Then up wi't a', my ploughman lad,
 And hey, my merry ploughman;
 Of a' the trades I do ken,
 Commend me to the ploughman.

My ploughman he comes hame at e'en,
 He's aften wat and weary;
 Cast off the wat, put on the dry,
 And gae to bed, my Dearie!

I will wash my ploughman's hose,
 And I will dress his o'erlay;
 I will mak' my ploughman's bed,
 And cheer him late and early.

I hae been east, I hae been west,
 I hae been at Saint Johnston,
 The bonniest sight that e'er I saw
 Was the ploughman laddie dancin'.

Snaw-white stockings on his legs,
And siller buckles glancin';
A gude blue bannet on his head,
And O, but he was handsome!

Commend me to the barn-yard,
And the corn-mou,' man;
I never gat my coggie fou
Till I met wi' the ploughman.

He dignifies his calling as poet of the country and country people in his "Poem on Pastoral Poetry" with a devotion worthy of Virgil's *Bucolics*.

As a lover he fills every possible role. With idyllic tenderness he describes the innocence, directness, sweetness and power of early love.

O happy love! where love like this is found!
O heart-felt raptures, bliss beyond compare!
I've paced much this weary, mortal round,
And sage experience bids me this declare—
If Heaven a draught of heavenly pleasure spare,
One cordial in this melancholy vale,
'Tis when a youthful, loving, modest pair,
In other's arms breathe out the tender tale,
Beneath the milk-white thorn that scents the ev'ning gale.

It is amazing how spontaneously he could enter into his various love affairs. It was his very life as shown in his poem dictated to David Siller, his poet friend.

But tent me, Davie, ace o' hearts!
(To say aught less wad wrang the cartes,
And Flatt'ry I detest)
This life has joys for you and I;
And joys that riches ne'er could buy;
And joys the very best.
There's a' the pleasures o' the heart,
The lover an' the frien';
Ye hae your Meg, your dearest part,
And I my darling Jean!

It warms me, it charms me,
To mention but her name;
It heats me, it beets me,
And sets me a' on flame!

His political poems are not in his best vein. They reveal his wider outlook, however, and show keenly how he judged the character of the leading men and issues of his day. His poem, "A Dream," was written on the birthday of King George III. and is a keen criticism of the times, in which the elder and younger Pitt, beside all of the M. P.'s of Scotland, together with the Prince of Wales and the King himself receive attention. The stanza addressed to the young Prince runs as follows:

For you, young Potentate o' Wales,
 I tell your Highness fairly,
 Down r'leasure's stream, wi' swelling sails
 I'm tauld ye're driving rarely;
 But some day ye may gnaw your nails,
 An' curse your folly sairly,
 That ere ye brak Diana's pales,
 Or rattl'd dice wi' Charlie,
 By night or day.

Among his other political poems, more or less personal and illustrative of his keenness of insight into human life are "The Five Carlins," "To Mr. Graham of Fintra," and the four "Election Ballads." That he was a truth speaker and a public reprover in the political realm cannot be denied.

It is, however, in the religious outlook of his life that we find him most trenchant in his criticism as well as positive in his predilections. He took sides with the Moderates against the Evangelicals or New Lights on the one side and the High Calvinists or Auld Lights on the other. Almost all his satires are born out of this struggle of creeds. Indeed his best satires are those ridiculing the hypocrisy and pretensions of the so-called extreme Holiness People of his day, *e. g.*, "The Holy Fair," "The Ordination," "Address to the Unco' Guid or the Rigidly Righteous," "The Kirk's Alarm," "Holy Willie's Prayer," "The Twa Herds."

O thou, wha in the heav'n's dost dwell,
 Wha, as it pleases best thyself,
 Sends ane to heaven and ten to hell,
 A' for they glory,
 And no for only guid or ill
 They've done afore thee!

I bless and praise thy matchless might,
Whan thousands thou hast left in night,
That I am here afore thy sight,
For gifts an' grace,
A burnin' and a shinin' light
To a' this place.

What was I, or my generation,
That I should get sic exaltation?
I, wha deserve sic just damnation
For broken laws
Five thousand years 'fore my creation
Through Adam's cause.

When frae my mither's womb I fell,
You might ha'e plunged me into hell,
To gnash my gums, to weep and wail,
In burnin' lake,
Where damned devils roar and yell,
Chained to a stake.

Yet I am here, a chosen sample,
To show thy grace is great and ample;
I'm here a pillar in thy temple,
Strong as a rock,
A guide, a buckler, an example
To a' thy flock.

O L—d! thou kens what zeal I bear
When drinkers drink, and swearers swear,
And singing there, and dancing here,
Wi' great and sma';
For I am keepit by thy fear,
Free frae tham a'.

But yet, O L—d! confess I must,
At times I'm fashed wi' fleshly lust;
And sometimes, too, wi' worldly trust,
Vile self gets in;
But thou remembers we are dust,
Defiled in sin.

• • • • •
Maybe thou lets this fleshly thorn
Beset thy servant e'en and morn,
Lest he owre high and proud should turn,
'Cause he's sae gifted!
If sae, thy han' maun e'en be borne
Until thou lift it.

Is the Best in Burns Typically Scotch?

L—d, bless thy chosen in this place,
 For here thou hast a chosen race:
 But G—d confound their stubborn face,
 And blast their name,
 Who brings thy elders to disgrace
 And public shame!

L—d, mind Gawn Hamilton's deserts!
 He drinks, and swears and plays at cartes,
 Yet hae sae mony takin' arts
 Wi' great and sma',
 Frae G—d's ain priests the people's hearts
 He steals awa'.

An' whan we chastened him therefore,
 Thou kens how he bred sic a splore,
 As set the warld in a roar
 O' laughin' at us;
 Curse thou his basket and his store,
 Kail and potatoes!

L—d, hear my earnest cry and prayer,
 Against the presbyt'ry of Ayr;
 Thy strong right hand, L—d, mak' it bare
 Upo' their heads!
 L—d, weigh it down, and dinna spare,
 For their misdeeds!

O, L—d, my G—d! that glib-tongued Aiken,—
 My very heart and soul are quakin',
 To think how we stood groanin', shakin',
 And Swat wi' dread;
 While Auld wi' hinging lip gaed snakin',
 And hid his head.

L—d, in the day of vengeance try him!
 L—d, visit them wha did employ him!
 And pass not in thy mercy by 'em,
 Nor hear their prayer.
 But, for thy people's sake, destroy 'em,
 And dinna spare!

But, L—d, remember me and mine
 Wi' mercies temp'ral and divine.
 That I for gear and grace may shine,
 Excell'd by name,
 An' a' the glory shall be thine.
 Amen, amen!

This last verse reminds us of the prayer frequently quoted—

"Lord bless me, my wife, my son John and his wife. We four and no more."

As a Moderate he tried to avoid the extremes of action. One almost feels, however, that much of his satire is but a cloak to his own peculiar weakness. His sentiment in "Address to the Unco' Guid or Rigidly Righteous" reminds us of one of Robert Louis Stevenson's sayings: "There is so much bad in the best of us, and so much good in the worst of us, that it hardly behooves any of us to talk about the rest of us." He begins by addressing these rigidly righteous ones

O, ye wha are sae guid yoursel'
Sae pious and sae holy,
Ye've nought to do but mark and tell
Your neebour's faults and folly!

and finally concludes:

Then gently scan your brother man
Still gentler sister woman;
Though they may gang a kennin wrang,
To step aside is human;
One point must still be greatly dark,
They moving why they do it!
And just as lamely can ye mark
How far, perhaps, they rue it.

Who made the heart, 'tis he alone
Decidedly can try us,
He knows each chord—its various tone,
Each spring—its various bias;
Than at the balance let's be mute,
We never can adjust it;
What's done we partly may compute,
But know not what's resisted.

We could easily multiply similar examples, but these suffice for our immediate purpose.

We wish to conclude with Burns' own religious tendencies. We cannot defend his weaknesses of character as a man. Genius never pardons irregularities, but we can apply his own standard of judgment of his fellow-man to himself. In a letter dated March, 1784, he writes:

I have often observed, in the course of my experience of human life, that every man, even the worst, has something good about him; though very

often nothing else but a happy temperament of constitution inclining him to this or that virtue. For this reason, no man can say in what degree any other person, besides himself, can be, with strict justice, called wicked. Let any of the strictest character of regularity of conduct among us, examine impartially how many vices he has never been guilty of, not from any care or vigilance, but for want of opportunity, or some accidental circumstance intervening; how many of the weaknesses of mankind he has escaped, because he was out of the line of such temptation; and, what often, if not always, weighs more than all rest, how much he is indebted to the world's good opinion, because the world does not know all; I say, any man who can thus think, will scan the failings, nay, the faults and crimes of mankind around him with a brother's eye.

The man who so tried to scan his brother man in love could not fail to have experienced the deeper, fundamental elements of religious experience. Man as man stands and lives at first hand with his fellow-man and with his Maker. Witness the poem already quoted, "A Man's a Man for a' That," and again the "Epistle to Davie, a Brother Poet"—

What tho', like commoners of air,
We wander out, we know not where,
But either house or hal'?
Yet nature's charms, the hills and woods,
The sweeping vales, the foaming floods,
Are free alike to all.
In days when daisies deck the ground,
And blackbirds whistle clear,
With honest joy our hearts will bound,
To see the coming year:
On braes when we please then,
We'll sit and sowth a tune:
Syne rhyme till't, we'll time till't,
And sing't when we hae done.

It's no in titles nor in rank;
It's no in wealth like Lon'on bank,
To purchase peace and rest;
It's no in making muckle, mair:
It's no in books, it's no in lear,
To make us truly blest:
If happiness hae not her seat
And center in the breast,
We may be wise, or rich, or great,
But never can be blest:

Nae treasures, nor pleasures,
Could make us happy lang:
The heart ay's the part ay,
That makes us right or wrang.

Ah! truly—"Out of the heart are the issues of life."

Representative of his sense of confession before Almighty God, could there be a psalm more touching than the following poem:

Is there a whim-inspired fool,
Owre fast for thought, owre hot for rule,
Owre blate to seek, owre proud to snool,
Let him draw near;
And owre this grassy heap sing dool,
And drap a tear.

Is there a Bard of rustic song
Who, noteless, steals the crowd among,
That weekly this area throng,
O, pass not by!
But, with a frater-feeling strong,
Here, heave a sigh.

Is there a man whose judgment clear,
Can others teach the course to steer,
Yet runs, himself, life's mad career,
Wild as the wave;
Here pause—and, thro' the starting tear,
Survey this grave.

The poor inhabitant below
Was quick to learn and wise to know,
And keenly felt the friendly glow,
And softer flame,
But thoughtless follies laid him low,
And stain'd his name!

Reader, attend—whether thy soul
Soars fancy's flights beyond the pole,
Or darkling grubs this earthly hole,
In low pursuit:
Know, prudent cautious self control
Is wisdom's rott.

Or again, note the resignation in the poem—"A Prayer Under the Pressure of Violent Anguish."

O Thou great Being! what thou art
Surpasses me to know:
Yet sure I am, that known to Thee
Are all Thy works below.

Thy creature here before Thee stands,
All wretched and distrest;
Yet sure those ills that wring my soul:
Obey Thy high behest.

Sure, Thou, Almighty, canst not act
From cruelty or wrath!
O, free my weary eyes from tears,
Or close them fast in death.

But if I must afflicted be,
To suit some wise design:
Then, man my soul with firm resolves
To bear and not repine.

His versions of the first psalm and the first six verses of the
ninetieth psalm are like confessions of faith.

O Thou, the first, the greatest friend
Of all the human race!
Whose strong right hand has ever been
Their stay and dwelling place!

Before the mountains heav'd their heads
Beneath Thy forming hand,
Before this ponderous globe itself
Arose at Thy command.

That pow'r which rais'd and still upholds
This universal frame,
From countless, unbeginning time
Was ever still the same.

Those mighty periods of years
Which seem to us so vast,
Appear no more before Thy sight
Than yesterday that's past.

Thou giv'st the word; Thy creature, man,
Is to existence brought;
Again thou say'st, "ye sons of men,
Return ye into nought!"

Thou layest them, with all their cares
In everlasting sleep:
As with a flood thou tak'st them off
With overwhelming sweep.

They flourish like the morning flow'r,
In beauty's pride array'd:
But long ere night cut down it lies
All wither'd and decay'd.

We return to the statement of the subject—"Is the Best in Burns Typically Scotch?"

We have developed an argument in outline and illustration for the negative side of this question somewhat unlike the rather slight references of his biographers. The appeal is usually made to the few poems in which he actually reaches beyond his native land for material, as in a few of his political poems or in the few instances where his poems rise to clear, abstract statements of universal truths or principles. In making clear the case along these lines, the material would be scant indeed and the plea often made for Burns' larger universality on the basis of these arguments is rather weak and ineffective. We have preferred to take Burns in his strongest points of emphasis, and we would say that Burns at his best is typically Scotch, but that the best in Burns is not merely typically Scotch, but human and universal. He goes to the depth of the Scottish personality and patriotism and lays bare the deeper springs of the heart and mind and we see Scotland in the brotherhood of nations and the Scotchman at one with his fellows in the brotherhood of man. His faithfulness to his point of view and contact leads him to the vision of the universal in the individual and the race. Even as a master mind that enters any one of the arts, finds in his own the universal laws of unity, proportion, movement and of life, so our poet true to the peasant and peasantry of Scotland, plays upon the invisible strings of humanity's æolian harp. We hear the music and lo, a sort of Pentecostal miracle is wrought again and "we hear, every man in his own tongue," the wonderful and infinite things of the human heart.

O Thou great Being! what thou art
Surpasses me to know:
Yet sure I am, that known to Thee
Are all Thy works below.

Thy creature here before Thee stands,
All wretched and distress;
Yet sure those ills that wring my soul:
Obey Thy high behest.

Sure, Thou, Almighty, canst not act
From cruelty or wrath!
O, free my weary eyes from tears,
Or close them fast in death.

But if I must afflicted be,
To suit some wise design:
Then, man my soul with firm resolves
To bear and not repine.

His versions of the first psalm and the first six verses of the
ninetieth psalm are like confessions of faith.

O Thou, the first, the greatest friend
Of all the human race!
Whose strong right hand has ever been
Their stay and dwelling place!

Before the mountains heav'd their heads
Beneath Thy forming hand,
Before this ponderous globe itself
Arose at Thy command.

That pow'r which rais'd and still upholds
This universal frame,
From countless, unbeginning time
Was ever still the same.

Those mighty periods of years
Which seem to us so vast,
Appear no more before Thy sight
Than yesterday that's past.

Thou giv'st the word; Thy creature, man,
Is to existence brought;
Again thou say'st, "ye sons of men,
Return ye into nought!"

Thou layest them, with all their cares
In everlasting sleep:
As with a flood thou tak'st them off
With overwhelming sweep.

They flourish like the morning flow'r,
In beauty's pride array'd:
But long ere night cut down it lies
All wither'd and decay'd.

We return to the statement of the subject—"Is the Best in Burns Typically Scotch?"

We have developed an argument in outline and illustration for the negative side of this question somewhat unlike the rather slight references of his biographers. The appeal is usually made to the few poems in which he actually reaches beyond his native land for material, as in a few of his political poems or in the few instances where his poems rise to clear, abstract statements of universal truths or principles. In making clear the case along these lines, the material would be scant indeed and the plea often made for Burns' larger universality on the basis of these arguments is rather weak and ineffective. We have preferred to take Burns in his strongest points of emphasis, and we would say that Burns at his best is typically Scotch, but that the best in Burns is not merely typically Scotch, but human and universal. He goes to the depth of the Scottish personality and patriotism and lays bare the deeper springs of the heart and mind and we see Scotland in the brotherhood of nations and the Scotchman at one with his fellows in the brotherhood of man. His faithfulness to his point of view and contact leads him to the vision of the universal in the individual and the race. Even as a master mind that enters any one of the arts, finds in his own the universal laws of unity, proportion, movement and of life, so our poet true to the peasant and peasantry of Scotland, plays upon the invisible strings of humanity's æolian harp. We hear the music and lo, a sort of Pentecostal miracle is wrought again and "we hear, every man in his own tongue," the wonderful and infinite things of the human heart.

VII.

CONTEMPORARY SOCIOLOGY.

BY PROF. A. V. HIESTER.

The first division of this introduction to the study of contemporary sociology has been concluded. It has to do with social experimentation as a source, a most important source, indeed, of social doctrine. It is to the infinitude of experiments, which have been projected from time to time by leaders of thought and action for the improvement of the social order, that the world owes so much, in the last analysis perhaps all, of its knowledge of the nature of human society, and of the peculiar limitations which surround it. These experiments, whether they failed or succeeded, have had the effect of awakening the social consciousness, inspiring social study and thought, and demonstrating the existence of a telic force in human society by which social growth may be controlled and the social order directed to a given end through the purpose and will of man. And with the larger interest in social phenomena, which is so characteristic of our time, the importance of primitive conditions and institutions for scientific sociology is being more and more recognized; so that the records of the past are being ransacked to-day as never before in the hope that they may throw new light on the problems and processes of the present.

The second division may be termed, somewhat loosely perhaps, social philosophy. Its province includes those contributions to social doctrine which have been made by the various ideal schemes of social organization contained in the writings of philosophers. Between these ideal schemes and the experiments for the improvement of the social order, which constitute the subject matter of the first division, there is a constant

and intimate connection. Social empiricism and social philosophy, like theory and practice everywhere, must necessarily advance in *pari passu* fashion. For, on the one hand, social experimentation is inevitably inspired and directed by philosophical ideals. And on the other, social experiments must influence social doctrine, since the speculative philosopher is after all more or less dependent upon objective realities to awaken and shape his ideals. Hegel says somewhere: "No one can escape from his own age; the spirit of his age is his own spirit likewise." There is in the world of mind something very analogous to the physical law of the indestructibility of matter. What is commonly called the creative imagination cannot create out of nothing any more than the mason or the carpenter. It can only take the materials supplied by the actual world of experience and combine or rearrange them into new, perhaps fanciful and even fantastic, forms, but forms, nevertheless, which are suggested and conditioned by that which already exists. And so the social philosopher—again using the term more or less loosely—or better perhaps, the social dreamer, idealist or visionary, is limited and controlled at every step, whether he is conscious of it or not, by the things which are implicit in the social order about him.

It is important to distinguish between two sorts of social philosophies. There are first those fancy-woven dreams of philosophers, which, while they have had no little influence in awakening thought on the nature of society and in guiding social practice, are not, and never have been, realizable, and which their authors never expected to be realized in their entirety. Some are keen but just criticisms of the existing social order designed to attract attention to social evils in the hope that adequate remedies may ultimately be found. Others are the unthinking protests of generous and humane persons keenly sympathizing with the miseries and wrongs of the masses, and striking blindly at the social evils of their time without knowing or waiting to know the causes of these evils.

Still others are the visions of minds filled with despair by existing political and economic conditions, and solacing themselves with weaving dreams of a perfect social state in which all wrongs will be righted and all men be happy and contented. Some of these dreams, again, have issued in immediate and ill-considered attempts to improve social conditions, while others have long remained confined to the realms of dreamland only to influence the social thought and practice of later ages. Sometimes they have been garbed in sober prose. But more frequently they have donned the robes of romance. This is obviously a convenient and safe device for those who are able to look beyond the horizon of their own age, as well as for those who fear to express their social opinions in plain terms. But the inevitable effect of once adopting the form of romance for a scheme of social organization is to give free sweep to the imagination, so that society is painted "without any thought as to whether it is realizable in a given time or place, or whether it is compatible even in a general way with the moral and physical conditions of human nature." And the usual result is a chimerical and impossible goal which is not in accord with man's psychical nature, nor with the laws of his physical existence, nor yet with his material environment, and which is not, therefore, realizable by any forces subject to human purpose or will.

The other class of social philosophies differ from the first in being based, not on idle dreams, but on a scientific study of human society. They are the product of the logical faculties of the mind rather than of the imagination, and they exhibit, therefore, an enduring practical faith that is altogether wanting in the others. They profess to be compatible with the general conditions of human existence. Instead of setting up impossible ideals their aim is to show, not only what human society can be through the operation of forces subject to the purpose and will of man, but what, indeed, it is destined to be through the progressive interplay of natural and human forces in a process of evolution. An excellent illustration of this class of social philosophies is modern socialism.

A. Social philosophies of the first class are commonly known as utopias. The word is derived from the Greek *οὐ τόπος* which means "nowhere land" and has been generalized from the title of Sir Thomas More's famous romance of the sixteenth century. While utopias may be found in every age and in many different lands they have usually appeared in the presence of social crises. It is when men find themselves face to face with social conditions fast culminating in scepticism, despair and anarchy, and when they have lost their bearings amidst the crumbling foundations of the past and the mysterious forces of a new era, that they turn most readily to the making of imaginary states. And these imaginary states naturally reflect the particular conditions which produced them, so that at one time they are religious in character and at another philosophical or materialistic.

It is not possible to penetrate far enough into the past to distinguish the beginnings of social philosophy. For ever since the time when there was the first glimmering of social consciousness, that is, ever since man was man, there have been those who have thought and philosophized about society. While fragments of utopian schemes, such as more or less concrete plans of government, law, industry or religion, may be met with before Plato's time, he was not only the first to advance general theories and systems, but no one before him knew so well how "to give a body to these imaginary conceptions and make the most of them by the graces of poetry and the power of dialectics." The age of utopians may very properly, therefore, be said to begin with the Athenian philosopher.

Plato's state is described at length in the "Republic" although many of its political and ethical views are to be found also in his other writings, notably the "Protagoras," "Meno," "Gorgias," "Philebus" and "Laws." Like later utopias the "Republic" presents two faces. From one point of view it is a state framed on Hellenic lines. Its institutions and circumstances, as well as its historical and environmental setting, are in many instances those of the prevailing Greek city-state

which was so familiar to Plato. It is even possible to trace certain features to particular Hellenic states. Thus the prohibition of money, the vesting of the government in a military caste, and the training of all youth in military exercises, are clearly of Spartan origin. Like other distinguished Athenians Plato was most favorably impressed by the rigid discipline which obtained in Sparta and which was so palpably lacking in democratic Athens. From Athens, on the other hand, he took his principle of personal freedom, his grace and beauty of life, and his scheme of literary and philosophical education.

That Plato was strongly influenced by Hellenic thought and practice is shown by another body of facts. In his state, as in all the Hellenic states, whether democratic or aristocratic in their forms of government, citizenship is limited to a superior class. While no specific mention is made of slaves the existence of such a class is clearly implied. Of the modern principle of democracy, of the notion of a state in which all classes are harmonized, Plato knows nothing. The size of his state is that of the usual Greek city-state and its problems are the problems with which every Hellenic state was struggling. It is equipped for war as though war were a constant possibility. It has little or no friendly intercourse with other nations, and knows nothing of a federation of states to promote the mutual interests of its members. On the other hand, it implies the existence of such internal evils as individual self-seeking, the political struggles between rich and poor, the corrupting influence of wealth, the failure to utilize the energies and talents of all the inhabitants, and the lack of a trained and disinterested statesmanship. All this clearly reflects the actual circumstances of the Hellenic states in Plato's time, democratic Athens, no less than military Sparta, wealthy and oligarchical Corinth and despotically governed Syracuse. It is altogether probable, too, that Plato was materially influenced in his social views by the Pythagorean religious brotherhoods within the Greek world and the Egyptian caste system without it.

The other face presented by the "Republic" is that of a

purely imaginary state, a vision of a city in the clouds, in which social elements are combined that were never before put together, and to which nothing in the world of actual existence as Plato knew it bore any resemblance. Plato's state is, therefore, at the same time both an actual state on earth and an imaginary city in the skies, a history and a prophecy, a summing up of the past and an anticipation of the future. And it is just this two-facedness, this constant combining of diverse elements and tendencies, that gives to the "Republic" its strange and paradoxical character. The two faces which it presents cannot go together and it is, therefore, an imperfect whole. Whether this arises from an enlargement of the plan of the work or from its composition at different times is a mooted question. Jowett ventures the opinion that the apparent discrepancy may be owing to the discordant elements which Plato has attempted to unite in a single whole without being himself able to recognize the inconsistency which is so obvious to us.

The "Republic" is a comprehensive scheme of government, industry and morals, and only its larger features can be noted. It is professedly an inquiry into the nature of justice—righteousness is a better word—which is made to consist, not in each receiving what is his due, but in each laboring for the good of the whole. It is an ideal of duties, therefore, rather than of rights. Writing in a time of social and political fermentation when the opposite forces of despotism and democracy were struggling for the mastery, Plato would avoid the greed of egotism, the common principle of both, by completely subordinating the individual to the state. But the only effective means of accomplishing this, according to his way of thinking, is to suppress absolutely all sense of private interest; for so long as there are private pleasures, pains and interests, men will pursue their own ends and the state will suffer. Hence Plato proposes a communistic state in which the principle of private property, together with all its attendant evils, and all social and political distinctions depending on wealth, will be abolished.

But Plato's communism does not stop with the transformation of economic conditions. In his zeal to suppress all sense of private interest he does not shrink from a community of wives and children. It is at this point that he parts company with most modern communists. While modern communism aims chiefly at the equal division of the material things of life, and is, therefore, primarily an economic movement, that of Plato is based on moral grounds. Something of its moral character may be seen in the singular fact that he applies it only to the rulers and guardians of the state. The lower classes are completely ignored, and apparently he does not care whether they are bought under the rule of communism or not. But a more convincing proof of the immaterial character of Plato's communism is its extension of the communal principle to wives and children. This makes it something very similar to the communism of the monastic orders of the Latin Church, for both rest on the principle that property cares and family ties are incompatible with the higher life of the individual, that they divert him from the pursuit of the ideal and heroic, and that they prevent him from serving the state with wholehearted devotion.

The communal ownership of wives and children is undoubtedly the most chimerical feature of Plato's state, and likewise the one that offends most against modern ideas of morality. But it was not so impossible a thing in Plato's age as it seems to us. For among the Greeks the tie binding the members of a family together was regarded as inferior in strength and sanctity to that of tribe or country. Then again the small size of a Greek state, and its historic development from clan and tribe, would naturally lend to the communal principle a sanction which it could not hope to obtain under the conditions of modern political life. But even for a small city state, such as all the Hellenic states were, Plato's ideal of a unity of the state so complete as to leave no difference save in degree between the government of a household and that of a state is altogether impracticable. And, furthermore, it does not fit

in with the general scheme of Plato's state, for the hard and fast line which he draws between the ruling class of guardians and warriors and the subject class of workers, and which existed in all the Greek states, must be an effectual bar to that perfect concord which he postulates for his state. Such a line of cleavage can only make two states, not one.

And then there is the very practical problem of the relations of the sexes. It was pointed out already by Aristotle that Plato's scheme for equalizing property would prove unworkable unless the state exercised a firm control over the birth rate. The criticism is sustained by modern experience for history teaches that the danger of overpopulation is certain to arise wherever men cease to be responsible for the care and support of their own children. Plato appears to have been aware of this danger. He would limit the size of his state to that of an average Greek city state. In this he was probably influenced as much by the necessity of maintaining a proper concord and community of interest in his state as he was by any Malthusian fear of overpopulation. To maintain the population of his state at the proper level, then, and also to avoid licentiousness, Plato proposes a system of marriage festivals at stated intervals for the effective regulation of marriage. Still another purpose of such regulation is the improvement of the race. At these marriage festivals the good will be mated with the good as often as possible and the bad with the bad as seldom as possible. The good will also be mated more frequently than the bad. Participation in these festivals is limited to prescribed age periods, from twenty-five to fifty-five for men and from twenty to forty for women, and any one forming a marriage connection without these limits, or at any time within them except with the consent of the rulers, will be guilty of impiety. The offspring of superior parents, that is the capable, the virtuous, the strong, the beautiful, the courageous, the patriotic, are taken from their mothers at birth and reared under the direction of the state; while the offspring of inferior parents, as well as the deformed and defective offspring of superior parents, will be destroyed.

While all this is chimerical to the last degree it touches a most important problem. Not only are the instincts of human nature too strong to be crushed out in this fashion, but even if the scheme could be carried out in the way proposed by Plato it would be at the cost of the best and highest things in life. The refining influences of home, the unselfish devotion of the members of a family to one another, the affections and higher emotions, all sentiment and imagination, would be sacrificed in the interest of a supposed improvement of the race, so that human nature would be reduced to the level of animals. But Plato's airy treatment of a pressing social question must not be permitted to obscure its real character and importance. The problem which he recognized and which he attempted to solve is still plaguing the social philosopher and scientist. In the light of our larger knowledge of such pathological phenomena as degeneracy, crime and pauperism it is receiving increasing attention, and biologists and students of eugenics are asking more and more insistently whether marriage should not be regulated by the state in the interest of a higher level of social well-being, and whether a healthy and capable race of human beings is not worth cultivating as much as a good strain of horses and cattle.

A less chimerical feature than communism, and one that is being increasingly realized in modern times is the principle of the equality of the sexes. This does not mean that the sexes are equal in capacity, for Plato admits in general the superior capacity of the male sex, but only that they have the same nature and that they should have, therefore, the same education, the same occupations, the same gymnastic exercises, the same training in the arts of war. As among the lower animals sex is only a superficial difference, and its incidents should not be made the basis of industrial, political and social distinctions. That the state should have the benefit of the services of all its citizens whatever their capacity is for Plato a fundamental principle.

In all this Plato was far in advance of Greek, as well as of

eastern, practice. Thus in Athens the woman was in no sense the equal of her husband. She had no share in his public activities. In the domestic sphere her position was one of marked inferiority. She was only her husband's housekeeper and the mother of his children; not his companion, not the mistress of his home, not the entertainer of his guests.

All social utopias make much of education but there are two considerations which give to education in Plato's state an unusual importance. The first is the provision already noted that all children are taken from their mothers at birth and reared under the direction of the state. The effect of this is to make the state directly responsible for all education. The other consideration is that the government which Plato provides for his state is a government of trained philosophers, so that its well being and perpetuity will largely depend upon the sort of training which it gives its future rulers.

The first purpose of education, as Plato sees it, is to provide a good environment for the child, "to place him in an atmosphere of health, in happy circumstances in which no sights nor sounds of evil, no allurements of passion, can hurt the character or vitiate the taste." He would, therefore, overhaul the old mythology and banish from the nursery and school all that is false and corrupting, the old nursery tales to which he applies the epithet of "blasphemous nonsense," and all stories that portray the vices and weaknesses, the lusts and treacheries, of gods and men. To provide the proper sort of literature for children Plato proposes the establishment of a censorship of stories which would accept only such as inculcate the virtues of truthfulness, temperance, purity, obedience and unselfishness. Over poets, painters, sculptors, architects and musicians he would exercise a similar censorship, forbidding them to portray in their works what is base or corrupting.

The supreme end of education, according to Plato, is the inculcation of truth. But by truth he means something very different from the modern understanding of that term. In common with the ancient philosophers he makes truth consist,

not in facts as modern philosophy does, but in ideas; not in particulars, but in abstractions and universals. He constantly depreciates the world of sense though admitting that sense particulars are shadows of the truth. Hence the first desideratum in education is the habit of abstraction which can be acquired, however, only through the study of the mathematical sciences, since they alone are capable of giving ideas of relation and arousing the dormant energies of thought. Another peculiarity of Plato's conception of truth is the identification of the moral and intellectual virtues. This is the Sociatic doctrine that the good and true are one, that virtue is knowledge, and that evil arises from ignorance.

Education is divided by Plato into two parts: music or literature to train the mind, and gymnastics to train the body. The two must be developed in harmonious proportions. Not only must the training of the body not be inconsistent with that of the mind, but the body must be trained wholly for the service of the mind. Plato was the first to maintain this principle.

Plato's preference for a government of philosophers is well calculated to shock modern notions, and the reasons which he assigns for such preference only add to its visionary character. Only philosophers are fitted to bear rule because they alone can apprehend ideas, that is, truth. In order to secure the rule of the best, for that is what aristocracy really means, a close watch will be kept over the children and youth to learn who exhibit steadily and consistently the virtues of truthfulness, temperance, courage and justice, who are apt to learn, who can govern themselves, who are faithful to every duty regardless of pleasure or pain, and who prefer the welfare of the state above every other interest. Those who have thus approved themselves are set apart and specifically trained for political service. If inquiry be made into the particular nature of this training it will be found to consist of instruction, not in finance, jurisprudence or military technique, as might be supposed, but again in abstract mathematics as a preparation

for the still more abstract conception of the good, which, according to Plato, is the ultimate ground of all truth. Probably no feature of the Republic other than its community of wives and children is so chimerical as this. The notion that merely to contemplate the idea of the good without any thought of the application of ethical principles to concrete conditions is a piece of nonsense. And the other notion that this knowledge of abstract good is to be found only in the pursuit of mathematical studies is still more absurd.

On its economic side the "Republic" is least chimerical. It contains some just economic analyses and in general reflects the accepted economic notions of its time. Plato's aim is to establish a self-sufficing commonwealth with as little contact as possible with the outside world. Foreign commerce is discouraged, and to this end Plato locates his state at some distance from the sea. In internal commerce the use of the precious metals is dispensed with as far as possible, and the lending of money at interest is practically forbidden. Slavery is accepted as an ordinance of nature. The lowest forms of labor are given over to slaves and foreigners. The industrial classes are regarded as an inferior order of beings, so degraded by their habitual occupations as to be unfit for the higher duties of men and citizens. There is no conception anywhere of the dignity of man as man. All industrial activities are strictly regulated to the end that the higher classes may be duly supplied with the necessities and comforts of life.

Plato's communism obviously leaves no room for social distinctions based on wealth or birth, for there is neither private property nor family life in his state. He does, however, recognize social classes, political and economic, which depend on capacity, which is in turn largely a matter of heredity. Thus God has created certain ones of gold to be the rulers of the state, others of silver to be helpers and auxiliaries, and still others of brass and iron to be husbandmen and craftsmen; and each must take his place in the state in accordance with his God-given nature. While the general tendency of nature

is to reproduce the qualities of the parents in their children, Plato admits that the nature of the child does not necessarily follow that of his parents. A golden father may have a silver son and *vice versa*. Then the son must go up or down in the social scale in accordance with his personal worth. The effect of this principle is a constant transposition of ranks as between parents and children. The particular manner in which this transposition of ranks is to be accomplished Plato unfortunately leaves to the imagination of the reader.

This conception of society as a ceaseless flux and flow is one of the most remarkable notions of the republic. It is not only contrary to Hellenic ideas but totally unlike anything with which Plato could have been acquainted anywhere. The only thing that can be compared with it is the Spartan practice of enfranchising Helots and degrading citizens under special circumstances. But this occasional and limited feature of Spartan life differs widely from the universal equality of opportunity, the always open door to power and privilege, which Plato provides for the citizens of his state. No such degree of social fluidity was known to the ancient world, and in modern times it has remained an unrealized and unrealizable ideal even in the most advanced democracies.

One more fanciful feature of the republic is the analogy which Plato draws between the state and the individual. As there are certain types of individual character so there are certain corresponding forms of the state. Corresponding to the ideal or aristocratic state there is the perfect individual, the aristocratic man, in whom the lower faculties are held in due subordination to the higher. In like manner Plato describes in a series of parallels four perverted states, the timocratic, the oligarchic, the democratic and the tyrannical, together with their corresponding types of individual character. These several types of state and character succeed one another in a fixed order, a prescribed cycle, in which each is derived from that which preceded it.

Much of this is pure fancy for it pushes the analogy, which

undoubtedly exists between an individual organism and a social organism, too far. A state is a complex of many individuals. Its character is the resultant of many individual characters mixed together; its will the balance of many divergent wills. No body of men can move with the pliancy and facility of a single man. The more action and feeling are diffused through a community the weaker and more uncertain they become.

A final inquiry has to do with the manner in which this ideal state was to be realized. Like the ancients Plato had no idea of the perfectibility of the human race. Like modern socialists also he had an abiding faith in the unlimited efficacy of laws and outward social arrangements generally as though society had no power of spontaneity and was moved only by external impulses. Hence he expected his ideal to be realized in so far as it was realizable—and it was more realizable in Plato's day than it would be in ours—not through a slow and painful process of growth and development, but suddenly and with overwhelming force. It was not something that should come through a gradual transformation of human character, but something that should spring in full panoply from the head of the legislator.

Because of its freshness and brilliancy, and the singular charm of its style, the republic is easily the most celebrated of the ideal social systems of antiquity. It is the unrivaled representative of what must have been a considerable literature but much of which has been lost. Among the Greeks, owing to their undoubted talent and predilection for speculation, every eminent writer who thought about political and economic phenomena at all had his ideal state. Xenophon's "*Oeconomicus*" and Aristotle's "*Politics*" have something of this speculative quality. But the Greek utopia which above all others deserves mention next to the "*Republic*" is Plutarch's *Lycurgus*, in which, under the guise of a biography, the author paints an ideal state as the conception of the half mythical or all mythical Spartan lawgiver. The general characteristics of Greek utopias have been noted in connection with the "*Re-*

public." They are: the complete subordination of the individual to the state in the interest of his development and its welfare; the minute regulation of every department of human life by the state; and a supreme belief in the efficacy of laws and institutions.

Apart from the writings of Hellenic poets and philosophers the ancient world contributed little to speculative social literature. In comparison with the Greeks the Romans were intensely practical, realistic and utilitarian, and probably the only social utopia which can be accredited to them, certainly the only one by an eminent writer, is Cicero's "*De Republica*," and of it only a few fragments have been preserved. These fragments clearly reflect Plato's ideas, for they borrow freely—in some instances they are hardly more than translations—from the "*Republic*," as well as from the "*Phædrus*," "*Phædo*" and "*Timæus*."

The spirit of the oriental theocracies of antiquity was altogether opposed to political and economic speculation. Their aim was the complete regulation of human life on the basis of inherited practical ideas, and the main characteristic of their social order was stability and conservation which usually degenerated into stagnation.

LANCASTER, PA.

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

JESUS AND THE GOSPEL: Christianity Justified in the Mind of Christ.
By James Denney, D.D., Professor of New Testament Language, Literature and Theology, United Free Church College, Glasgow. New York, A. C. Armstrong & Son.

This is an interesting, a timely, and a very able work. It deals throughout with one of the vital problems in the theology of the present day. Was the Jesus who lived and wrought and taught in Galilee the same as the Jesus whose portrait has been transmitted to us in the Gospels? Or has the portrait of the real Jesus been so colored by the worshipful regard of his followers, and so overlaid by legendary accretions of the early church, that, when at last we succeed in recovering it, it will be found to differ very greatly from that presented by our New Testament writers? Difficult as it may be to believe it, that is the problem which a century of investigation into the life of Jesus has forced upon us. In the work before us, Dr. Denney deals with this important but difficult problem.

The New Testament represents Christianity as the life of faith in Jesus Christ. Christ is conceived as a person of transcendent greatness. He is also represented as a real, historical person; and the representations of his greatness are conceived as true. Can this representation be maintained? Generally the question has been answered in the affirmative; but there has been a reaction, and this reaction has been profound and far-reaching. It has raised two questions which Dr. Denney examines at length in the present work. What those questions are he himself states in the following form: "The first is, How far is the description just given of the New Testament correct? Is it the case that the Christian religious life, as the New Testament exhibits it, really puts Jesus in the place indicated, and that everything in this life, and everything, especially in the relations of God and man, is determined by him? In other words, is it the case that from the beginning Christianity has existed only in the form of a faith which has Christ as its object, and not at all in the form of a faith which has had Christ simply as its living pattern? The second question is of importance to those who accept what seems at a glance the only possible answer to the first. It is this: Can the Christian religion, as the New Testament exhibits it, justify itself by an appeal to Jesus? Granting that the spiritual phenomenon is what it is

said to be, are the underlying historical facts sufficient to sustain it? In particular, it may be said, is the mind of Christians about Christ supported by the mind of Christ about himself? Is that which has come to be known in the world as Christian faith—known, let us admit, in the apostolic age and ever since—such faith as Jesus lived and died to produce? Did he take for himself the extraordinary place which he fills in the mind and the world even of primitive Christians, or was this greatness thrust upon him without his knowledge, against his will, and in inconsistency with his true place and nature? We are familiar with the idea that we can appeal to Christ against any phenomenon of our own age which claims to be Christian: is it not conceivable that we may have to appeal to him even against the earliest forms which Christianity assumed?"

As will be seen at a glance, the problem is one of profound significance. If both questions can be answered in the affirmative, our faith in the reality and truth of our holy religion will be reassured and strengthened; if even the second only must be answered in the negative, that faith will have to be very greatly modified, if not altogether abandoned.

Dr. Denney's book naturally falls into two parts. In the first he gives his answer to the former of the two questions, under the general title, "Christianity as it is exhibited in the New Testament." In the other he deals with "The historical basis of the Christian faith." He answers both inquiries in the affirmative.

In the second part of the work, which is by far the larger, the author presents a very able apology for the Christian religion. It is true, he tells us that his aim was not primarily apologetic; yet, before he reaches the end, he has given us a very able defence of our faith. He refutes, and refutes successfully as it seems to us, many of the negative conclusions of certain critics, who, starting out with the presupposition that Jesus was only a man such as we are, have tried to discredit the historic credibility of a large part of our Gospels, and thus to reconstruct a thoroughly naturalistic portrait of our Lord. Not only did the disciples conceive of Jesus as unique, and as standing in a class all by himself; but all that we know of him forces us to the conclusion that that was the way in which he conceived of himself. All the facts of the New Testament, as well as of the Apostolic Church, force us to that conclusion.

We most heartily commend the book to all our ministers. No one will make a mistake in buying and studying it. It will, we believe, prove a wholesome tonic for all whose faith has been disturbed by negative and destructive criticism of the New Testament. There is much searching criticism in the book; but it is of a positive and constructive character. It is not vitiated before-

hand by the negative, naturalistic presuppositions which characterize so much of the Biblical criticism of the present day.

WM. C. SCHAEFFER.

THE IDEA OF THE RESURRECTION IN THE ANTE-NICENE PERIOD. ("Historical and Linguistic Studies in Literature Related to the New Testament," Series II., Part VIII.) By Rev. Calvin Klopp Staudt, Ph.D. Chicago, The University of Chicago Press. Price, 50 cents.

This is a dissertation submitted to the faculty of the Graduate Divinity School of the University of Chicago in the author's candidacy for the degree of doctor of philosophy, and now published in the form of a neat brochure of ninety pages.

The author's aim is to trace historically the development of the idea of the resurrection from its origin in the Old Testament, through Jewish and Christian literature, to the end of the first quarter of the fourth century. The topics treated are as follows: Jewish and Greek Literature; The New Testament; The Apostolic Fathers; The Apologists; The Gnostics; The Great Polemicians; The Alexandrian School; The Later Writers.

The work shows careful study and investigation of the extant literature of the period. The author seems to have gone over, not only the books of the Old and New Testament, but also all the extant works of the Fathers, and to have carefully examined the passages bearing on the subject in hand. As such he has given us a distinctive and valuable contribution to our knowledge of this important doctrine. Such a historical study can not but be helpful at a time when the subject of the resurrection has once more become a burning question in our theological discussions. When the best minds of the age are trying to gain a clearer conception of the great mystery, and to restate the doctrine in such a form as to make it comprehensible by the modern mind, it is a matter of the first importance to trace its origin and development in the earliest extant literature on the subject. What was Jesus' conception of the resurrection? How did his designation, "The resurrection of the dead," or "The resurrection from the dead," become transformed into that of the creeds, "The resurrection of the flesh" and "The resurrection of the body"? How did the more spiritual conceptions of Jesus and of the New Testament degenerate into the more materialistic conceptions of the Fathers? These are among the subjects which Dr. Staudt has treated in an able and generally interesting fashion. We commend the essay to all who are interested in gaining a more accurate survey of the history of the doctrine of the resurrection.

WM. C. SCHAEFFER.

THE ATONEMENT. By the Rev. James Stalker, D.D., Professor of Church History and Christian Ethics in the United Free Church College, Aberdeen, Scotland. New York, A. C. Armstrong and Son. Pages 138.

This volume contains three lectures, delivered by the author, under the auspices of the Trustees of the McDonald of Ferintosh Trust, at Inverness, October 6, 7, 8, 1908. The subjects of the lectures are as follows: The New Testament Situation; The Old Testament Preparation; and The Modern Justification.

The lectures are in Dr. Stalker's well-known and felicitous style. By his former works, especially his *Life of Christ* and his *Life of St. Paul*, he has become widely and favorably known to the American religious public. Many who have enjoyed these earlier books will no doubt welcome this volume. It is a popular presentation of a great theme.

The lectures were no doubt intended to be what they are—a popular presentation of the subject treated: and one should hence not be disappointed in not finding in them an attempt at a systematic or scientific treatment of the doctrine of the Atonement. It is not a book for the student who is looking either for a history of the doctrine, or for its systematic statement. It goes but little beyond the Biblical statements. Yet many a devout believer, who is not looking for scientific theology, will find much that is both instructive and edifying in these lectures.

WM. C. SCHAEFFER.

A SECOND LEAF OF SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS FOR YOUNG CHILDREN: A Manual for Teachers and Parents. By Florence U. Palmer. New York, The Macmillan Company, 1908. Price, \$1.25 net.

This volume contains a series of lessons selected, arranged and adapted for the use of young children. As stated on the title page, it is intended to be a Manual for teachers and parents, and of course not to be placed into the hands of the children themselves. It assumes the need for the living teacher; and it contains only such selections of topics and Scripture passages, together with suggestive treatment, as the teacher can use in the presence of the class.

There are fourteen topics, each subdivided into from two to five subtopics. These topics are: Love, Courage, Joy, Speak the Truth, Our Heavenly Father, A New Commandment, Play, Happiness, Doing for Others, Work, Helping, Sharing, Thanksgiving and Christmas. Counting the subtopics there is a lesson for every Sunday in the year. The book likewise contains suggestions for review, as well as selections of music and illustrations.

In the present demand for graded lessons for the Sunday-school, this book will no doubt meet the wants of many. The selections are good, and the treatment suggestive. The story is

employed as the method for presenting and illustrating the truth. The primary teacher, even if she does not follow the order of topics, will find the book helpful. Yet we question whether it will pay any school to turn aside from the International Lessons for those here presented, especially now that an excellent series of graded lessons is prepared by the committee.

WM. C. SCHAEFFER.

THE CHURCH AND MODERN LIFE. By Washington Gladden. Boston and New York, Houghton, Mifflin and Company, 1908. Pages 221. Price, \$1.25 net.

The author is well known as a prominent Congregationalist preacher and former moderator of that denomination, and has a wide reputation as a writer of forceful religious works. He has contributed to progressive theological thought in such books as, "Who Wrote the Bible?" "How Much is Left of the Old Doctrines?" and "Where Does the Sky Begin?" which questions he has answered in clear and convincing style for popular reading. His main concern in recent publications, however, has been with social questions, as is evidenced in his books, "Tools and the Man," "Applied Christianity" and "Social Salvation." He has been a leader rather than a follower in treating of Christianity from the social standpoint, and presents his ideals as a prophet of righteousness.

In the preface of the book under review, he quotes: "The time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God," and thus prepares us for a criticism of the Church in its relation to the needs of modern life: He looks forward hopefully to the work that confronts the Church and studies the conditions with the constant thought of the young men and women to whom its future is committed. He defines the Church as "the entire body of Christian disciples who are organized into religious societies and are engaged in Christian work and worship," thus giving a broad basis for his discussion, which moves always upon a high plane of thought.

He leads up to his theme by considering the roots of religion, which he finds in our relation to nature, the revelation of Jesus, and the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. He compares our religion with other religions, and finds that all indications point to the survival of the Christian religion as the permanent, universal religion. All this is preparatory to the discussion of the social side of religion, which brings him to the heart of his subject. To him, the essence of Christianity is that "the blessedness of life must be in our social relations." In this connection, he demonstrates the necessity of social worship, and, by implication, the need of the Church as an organization. The primary function of

the Church he takes to be the Christianization of the social order. "The business of the Church is to save the world by establishing here the kingdom of heaven." He quotes freely from Rauschenbusch and other recent writers to show how imperfectly the Church has performed this function, and prophesies a new reformation to "bring society to Christ as a social Savior." He calls for the quickening of the social conscience and the redemption of society by a new evangelism. Of this new evangelism, he says "It will not emphasize the interest of the individual; it will rather emphasize the truth that the individual can only be saved when he identifies his own welfare with the welfare of his fellow men." In inspiring words, he appeals to the young men and women of this generation in the Church to make the Church what it ought to be, in inspiring worship, helpful charity, democracy, simplicity, and the extension of the life of the Church into every department of human life. The modern viewpoint, clear style, sane optimism, prophetic earnestness and constructive spirit make this work valuable for the preacher as well as for the young men and women to whom it appeals.

ROBERT JAMES PILGRAM.

INDIA, ITS LIFE AND THOUGHT. By John P. Jones, D.D., of South India. New York, The Macmillan Company. Pages 448. Price \$2.50 net.

This is a most interesting and illuminating book on a subject that possesses great power of fascination for the western mind. The author has lived thirty years in India, the land of mystery, and even now he says modestly that he cannot claim to speak *ex cathedra* on the subject. But there is abundant evidence all through the book, of his thorough knowledge, genuine sympathy, fairness of view and sound critical judgment. The book lacks the glow of poetry so conspicuous in H. Fielding Hall's works; but it is undoubtedly the most sane and satisfactory presentation of the life and thought of India that has appeared in recent years.

It is well known that in this "land of quiet repose" there is abroad, just now, a spirit of discontent and unrest so widespread and deep as to cause a great deal of concern to British statesmen. In fact there have been serious apprehensions of another great rebellion in India. Dr. Jones regards this movement as a part of what has been called the awakening of the East, and he gives an excellent analysis of the causes and conditions, political, social and religious, which have led to the present state of things. At the same time he is hopeful that a better mutual understanding between the British and the natives will remove the trouble and restore peace and good will to the land.

India, the author says, is the home of many faiths, the mother or foster-mother of nine great religions. These systems of re-

ligion, their environment, the physical features of the country, and the home life of the people, are all described in a very attractive way so that the reader gets an insight into the working forces which mould the institutions of the country. The chapter on the Caste System is especially illuminating. The author first refers to the entrance of four different races into India, differing in color and features, as lying at the foundation of the four different castes, and then mentions the traditional theory of the Hindus themselves to the effect that the Brahman proceeded out of the divine mouth of Brahmâ, the warlike Kshatriya from his shoulders, the commercial Vaisya, from his thighs, and the menial Sudra from his feet. The modern students of social order, however, discard these explanations, and offer instead the following theories: (a) The Religions; (b) The Tribal; (c) The Social; (d) The Occupational; (e) The Crossing Theory. The caste feeling, we are told, has never been more intense than at present, and it has never been nearer its dissolution.

In discussing the forms of religious life and thought, the details of which are brought out with great judgment and keen insight, stress is laid upon the great difference between a religion that is a mere philosophy or an aspiration, and one that is the concrete realization of the divine life in the soul. The Hindu ideal of life which finds its consummation in rest, contemplation and final absorption in the divine, also presents a sharp contrast to the Christian idea of an eternal life of activity and individuality in their higher perfection, commensurate with the difference between Karma and grace, the Buddha and Christ.

The strength and weakness of Islam in India receive due attention, and the modern religious movement is carefully analyzed and discussed. On the whole the progress of Christianity in India is very encouraging and in the final chapter the author takes a hopeful view of its ultimate triumph. He thinks, however, it will not be precisely the type of Western Christianity in its ecclesiastic and institutional forms, but a Christianity that "breathes of the spirit, and speaks forth in the language and life of the people."

JOHN S. STAHR.

OUTLINES OF THE LIFE OF PAUL. By William C. Schaeffer, D.D., Professor in the Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa. Philadelphia, Sunday School Board of the Reformed Church, 15th and Race Sts. Pages 91. Price 25 cents.

This clear, concise, suggestive little book, although very modest and unpretending, is really of great value both to the ordinary student of the Bible and to the Sunday-school teacher. It would be difficult to find within the same compass another book equally

sane, free from technicalities, and clear in presentation. Dr. Schaeffer indicates at the beginning of each chapter the Scripture passages which bear on the subject discussed, and he gives abundant evidence of a careful study of all the leading authorities, showing both the scholarship of the student and the skill of the teacher in his manner of presentation. The book is divided into sixteen chapters in which the leading events in the life of the great missionary apostle and his many-sided activity are carefully discussed, while the difficult problems and doubtful questions involved receive judicious and satisfactory treatment.

JOHN S. STAHR.

JOHN CALVIN, THEOLOGIAN, PREACHER, EDUCATOR, STATESMAN. By Rev. Philip Vollmer, Ph.D., D.D., Professor in the Central Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Dayton, Ohio. Philadelphia, Heidelberg Press. Pages 218. Price 75 cents.

This book comes as a welcome contribution to the celebration of the four hundredth anniversary of the birth of the great Reformer. It aims to be popular and practical rather than critical and exhaustive. At the same time the author shows careful study of his subject and thorough familiarity with the forces at work, the currents and counter-currents of life and thought during the period in which Calvin labored and in the shaping of which he had so large a part. It is evident, too, that he writes *con amore*, which makes his treatise all the more interesting.

The author treats first of all of the life of Calvin, his birth and training, his studies at the Universities, his conversion, and his activity as a minister and teacher. His great learning, his indefatigable energy, his great power as an organizer, his skill as a controversialist, and his unbending firmness in what he believed to be right and true are all set forth in the vicissitudes of his public and private life. After this we have a discussion of Calvin's personal character, his theology, etc.; and finally his relation to civil liberty and morality, and to modern thought, and his influence on Great Britain and Holland, on Switzerland and Germany, and on America, receive due consideration. The last two topics are treated respectively by Rev. J. I. Good, D.D., and Rev. Wm. H. Roberts, D.D., LL.D. The book is valuable as a contribution to church history and especially important and helpful at this time when the thoughts of men are so strongly centered upon the life and activity of this great leader.

JOHN S. STAHR.